arXiv:1207.3757v1 [math.ST] 16 Jul 2012

Quarticity and other functionals of volatility: efficient estimation

Jean Jacod* Mathieu Rosenbaum†

July 17, 2012

Abstract

We consider a multidimensional Itô semimartingale regularly sampled on $[0,t]$ at high frequency $1/\Delta_n$, with Δ_n going to zero. The goal of this paper is to provide an estimator for the integral over $[0,t]$ of a given function of the volatility matrix. To approximate the integral, we simply use a Riemann sum based on local estimators of the pointwise volatility. We show that although the accuracy of the pointwise estimation is essentially $\Delta_n^{1/4}$, this procedure reaches the parametric rate $\Delta_n^{1/2}$. However, the limiting process in the central limit theorem exhibits a bias. After a suitable bias correction, we obtain an unbiased central limit theorem for our estimator and show that it is asymptotically efficient within some classes of sub models.

Key words: semimartingale, high frequency data, volatility estimation, central limit theorem, efficient estimation

MSC2010: 60F05, 60G44, 62F12

1 Introduction

Let X be a semimartingale, which is observed at discrete times $i\Delta_n$ for $i = 0, 1, \cdots$, over a finite time interval $[0,T]$, with a discretization mesh Δ_n which is small and eventually goes to 0 (high-frequency setting). One of the main problems encountered in practice is the estimation of the integrated (squared) volatility (in finance terms), or equivalently of the continuous part of the quadratic variation $[X,X]_t$.

By now, this is a well understood problem, at least when X is an Itô semimartingale. For example, in the continuous one-dimensional case, if X takes the form

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b_s\,ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s\,dW_s$$

---

*Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu, 4 Place Jussieu, 75 005 Paris, France (CNRS – UMR 7586, and Université Pierre et Marie Curie), Email: jean.jacod@upmc.fr

†Laboratoire de Probabilités et Modèles Aléatoires, 4 Place Jussieu, 75 005 Paris, France (CNRS – UMR 7599, and Université Pierre et Marie Curie), Email: mathieu.rosenbaum@upmc.fr

the approximate quadratic variation $\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]}(X_{i\Delta_n}-X_{(i-1)\Delta_n})^2$, which of course converges to $[X,X]_t=\int_0^t \sigma_s^2\,ds$, enjoys a Central Limit Theorem (CLT): the difference between these two processes, normalized by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}$, converges stably in law to a limit which is conditionally on X a continuous Gaussian martingale with quadratic variation (equivalently, with variance) twice the so-called "quarticity", that is $2\int_0^t \sigma_s^4\,ds$.

Although later we consider a much more general framework, allowing X to be multi-dimensional and with jumps, in the introduction we pursue the discussion in this special one-dimensional continuous case. In various statistical problem one needs to estimate not only the quarticity, but functionals of the form

$$V(g)_t=\int_0^t g(c_s)\,ds, \qquad \text{where} \ \ c_s=\sigma_s^2$$

for relatively general test functions g, and to derive associated CLTs, see [6]; notice that we plug in the "spot" squared volatility c_t rather than σ_t, since in any case it is impossible to determine the sign of σ_t on the basis of the observation of the path $t\mapsto X_t$. The case $g(x)=x$ corresponds to the usual integrated volatility, and $g(x)=x^2$ to the quarticity.

Toward this aim, two methods are currently at hand:

1. The first one is available if $g(x)=\mathbb{E}(f(U(x)_1,\cdots,U(x)_k))$ for all $x\geq 0$, where the $U(x)_j$'s are independent $\mathcal{N}(0,x)$ variables and f is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^k$, of polynomial growth. Then we know that

$$U^n(f)_t=\Delta_n\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k+1} f\Big(\frac{\Delta_i^nX}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}},\cdots,\frac{\Delta_{i+k-1}^nX}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\Big), \qquad \text{where} \ \ \Delta_i^nX=X_{i\Delta_n}-X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, \tag{1.1}$$

   converges to $V(g)_t$ in probability, and if f is C^1 the rate of convergence is $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$, and in the associated CLT the limiting conditional variance is $\int_0^t F(c_s)\,ds$ for a suitable function F.

2. The second one consists in using estimators for the spot volatility and approximating the integral $V(g)_t$ by Riemann sums, in which the spot volatility is replaced by its estimator; that is, we set

$$V^n(g)_t=\Delta_n\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} g(\widehat{c}_i^{\,n}), \quad \text{where} \ \ \widehat{c}_i^{\,n}=\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1}(\Delta_{i+j}^nX)^2 \tag{1.2}$$

   for an arbitrary sequence of integers such that $k_n\to\infty$ and $k_n\Delta_n\to 0$. Then one knows that $V^n(g)_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} V(g)_t$ (when g is continuous and of polynomial growth). But so far nothing is known about the rate of convergence of these estimators.

The first method is quite powerful and gives optimal rates, but the special form of g puts strong constraints on g (for example, it is C^∞ on $(0,\infty)$, and much more). To tell the truth, by far the most useful test functions g are the powers $g_p(x)=x^p$ (recall that $x\geq 0$ here) for $p>0$, which are associated as above with $f_p(x)=|x|^{2p}/m_{2p}$, where m_q is the qth absolute moment of $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Nevertheless, some functions g of interest are not, or not in an obvious way, of this form or, more generally, linear combinations of functions of this form. This is particularly true in the multivariate case, with X being d-dimensional and thus U above as well: for an arbitrary (smooth) function g on the set $\mathcal{M}_d^+$ of all $d\times d$ symmetric nonnegative matrices, it is rather a difficult task in practice to find an integer $k\geq 1$ and a function f on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ such that, for all $x\in\mathcal{M}_d^+$, we have $g(x)=\mathbb{E}(f(U(x)_1,\cdots,U(x)_k))$, where again the $U(x)_j$'s are (d-dimensional) i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,x)$.

In addition, this first method does not provide efficient estimation in general. To see that, consider the toy example $X_t=\sigma W_t$, where σ is a constant, and $c=\sigma^2$, and $\Delta_n=\frac{1}{n}$ and $T=1$. We thus observe the increments Δ_i^nX for $i=1,\cdots,n$, or equivalently the n variables $Y_i=\Delta_i^nX/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$. These variables are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,c)$, so the asymptotically best estimators for c (efficient in all possible senses, and also the MLE) are $\widehat{c}_n=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(Y_i)^2=\sum_{i=1}^n(\Delta_i^nX)^2$, with convergence rate $\sqrt{n}$ and asymptotic variance $2c^2$. If instead one wants to estimate c^p for some $p\neq 1$ in $(0,\infty)$, one can use $\widehat{c}(p)_n=\frac{1}{n\,m_{2p}}\sum_{i=1}^n|Y_i|^{2p}=\frac{n^{1-p}}{m_{2p}}\sum_{i=1}^n|\Delta_i^nX|^{2p}$, and the ordinary Central Limit Theorem tells us that the rate of convergence is again $\sqrt{n}$, and the asymptotic variance is $\frac{m_{4p}-m_{2p}^2}{m_{2p}^2}\,c^p$: this is exactly what the first method above does. But this is not optimal, the asymptotically optimal estimators being $(\widehat{c}_n)^p$ (the MLE again), with rate $\sqrt{n}$ and asymptotic variance $2p^2c^{2p}$, smaller than the previous one when $p\neq 1$. Now, taking $(\widehat{c}_n)^p$ is exactly what the second method (1.2) does.

The aim of this paper is to develop the second method, and in particular to provide a Central Limit Theorem, with the rate $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$, and with an asymptotic variance always smaller than if one uses the first method. About efficiency, and despite the title of the paper, we do not really examine the question in the general non-parametric or semi-parametric setting assumed below, since even for the simpler problem of estimating integrated volatility the concept of efficiency in this setting is not well established so far. Instead, we will term as “efficient” a procedure which is efficient in the usual sense for the sub-model consisting in the toy model $X_t=\sigma W_t$ above, or for more general sub-models for which the concept of efficiency is well defined: for example our estimators will be efficient in the sense of the convolution theorem, for the Markov-type models recently studied by Clément, Delattre and Gloter in [2].

This will be done in the multivariate setting and when X possibly has jumps (upon suitably truncating the increments in (1.2) if it is the case, in the spirit of [3, 4]), and under the additional assumption that c_t itself is an Itô semimartingale. We should mention right away that for the CLT one needs to add to $V^n(g)$ a suitable de-biasing term, and also that when X jumps one needs in addition the jumps of X to be summable, which is exactly the same assumptions under which the truncated versions of $U^n(f)$ in (1.1) converge with rate $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 is devoted to presenting the assumptions. Results are given in Section 3, and all proofs are gathered in Section 4.

2 Setting and Assumptions

The underlying process X is d-dimensional, and observed at the times $i\Delta_n$ for $i=0,1,\cdots$, within a fixed interval of interest $[0,t]$. For any process we use the notation Δ_i^nY defined in

(1.1) for the increment over the ith observation interval. We assume that the sequence Δ_n goes to 0. The precise assumptions on X are as follows:

First, X is an Itô semimartingale on a filtered space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}, \mathbb{P})$. It can be written in its Grigelionis form, as follows, using a d-dimensional Brownian motion W and a Poisson random measure μ on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times E$, with E is an auxiliary Polish space and with the (non-random) intensity measure $\nu(dt, dz) = dt \otimes \lambda(dz)$ for some σ-finite measure λ on E:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t \;=\; & X_0 + \int_0^t b_s\,ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s\,dW_s + \int_0^t \int_E \delta(s,z)\,1_{\{\|\delta(s,z)\|\leq 1\}}\,(\mu-\nu)(ds,dz) \\ & + \int_0^t \int_E \delta(s,z)\,1_{\{\|\delta(s,z)\|>1\}}\,\mu(ds,dz). \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

This is a vector-type notation: the process b_t is $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued optional, the process σ_t is $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$-valued optional, and $\delta = \delta(\omega, t, z)$ is a predictable $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued function on $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times E$.

The spot volatility process $c_t = \sigma_t \sigma_t^*$ (* denotes transpose) takes its values in the set $\mathcal{M}_d^+$ of all nonnegative symmetric $d \times d$ matrices. We suppose that c_t is again an Itô semimartingale, which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} c_t \;=\; & c_0 + \int_0^t \widetilde{b}_s\,ds + \int_0^t \widetilde{\sigma}_s\,dW_s + \int_0^t \int_E \widetilde{\delta}(s,z)\,1_{\{\|\widetilde{\delta}(s,z)\|\leq 1\}}\,(\mu-\nu)(ds,dz) \\ & + \int_0^t \int_E \widetilde{\delta}(s,z)\,1_{\{\|\widetilde{\delta}(s,z)\|>1\}}\,\mu(ds,dz). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

with the same W and μ as in (2.1). This is indeed *not a restriction*: if X and c are two Itô semimartingales, we have a representation as above for the pair (X, c) and, if the dimension of W exceeds the dimension of X one can always add fictitious component to X, arbitrarily set to 0, so that the dimensions of X and W agree. Notice also that since c_t is symmetrical, in (2.2) we could restrict our attention to the components c_t^{jl} with $1 \leq j \leq l \leq d$, for example. From a notation viewpoint, however, it is simpler to model the full matrix c_t, even though it is redundant.

In (2.2), $\widetilde{b}$ and $\widetilde{\sigma}$ are optional and $\widetilde{\delta}$ is as δ; moreover $\widetilde{b}$ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ are $\mathbb{R}^{d^2}$-valued. Finally, we need the spot volatility of the volatility and "spot covariation" of the continuous martingale parts of X and c, which are

$$\widetilde{c}_t^{ij,kl} = \sum_{m=1}^d \widetilde{\sigma}_t^{ij,m} \widetilde{\sigma}_t^{kl,m}, \qquad \widetilde{c}_t^{\prime i,jk} = \sum_{l=1}^d \sigma_t^{il} \widetilde{\sigma}_t^{jk,l}.$$

The precise assumption on the coefficients are as follows, with r a real in $[0, 2]$ and $\|.\|$ denoting the Euclidean norm on any finite-dimensional linear space:

Assumption (A-r): There are a sequence (J_n) of nonnegative bounded λ-integrable functions on E and a sequence (τ_n) of stopping times increasing to ∞, such that

$$t \leq \tau_n(\omega) \implies \|\delta(\omega,t,z)\|^r \wedge 1 + \|\widetilde{\delta}(\omega,t,z)\|^2 \wedge 1 \leq J_n(z) \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover the processes b_t, $\widetilde{b}_t$, $\widetilde{c}_t$ and $\widetilde{c}_t^{\prime}$ are càdlàg, and the maps $t \mapsto \delta(\omega, t, z)$ and $t \mapsto \widetilde{\delta}(\omega, t, z)$ are càglàd (recall that δ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ should be predictable). □

The bigger r is, the weakest Assumption (A-r) is, and when (A-0) holds the process X has finitely many jumps on each finite interval. The part of (A-r) concerning the jumps of

X implies that $\sum_{s\leq t}\|\Delta X_s\|^r<\infty$ a.s. for all $t<\infty$, and it is in fact "almost" implied by this property.

Remark 2.1 Some degree of regularity in time seems to be needed for $b,\widetilde{b},\widetilde{c},\widetilde{c}',\delta,\widetilde{\delta}$. For $b,\widetilde{b},\widetilde{c},\widetilde{c}'$ one could replace càdlàg by càglàd (or replace for instance b_t by b_{t-}), since only the integrals of these four processes with respect to Lebesgue measure are relevant.

3 The Results

3.1 A First Central Limit Theorem.

For defining the estimators of the spot volatility, we first choose a sequence k_n of integers which satisfies, as $n\to\infty$:

$$k_n\ \sim\ \frac{\theta}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}},\qquad \theta\in(0,\infty), \tag{3.1}$$

and a sequence u_n in $(0,\infty]$. The $\mathcal{M}_d^+$-valued variables $\widehat{c}_i^n$ are defined, componentwise, as

$$\widehat{c}_i^{n,lm}=\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1}\Delta_{i+j}^nX^l\,\Delta_{i+j}^nX^m\,1_{\{\|\Delta_{i+j}^nX\|\leq u_n\}}, \tag{3.2}$$

and they implicitly depend on Δ_n,k_n,u_n.

One knows that $\widehat{c}_{[t/\Delta_n]}^n\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}c_t$ for any t, and there is an associated Central Limit Theorem under (A-2), with rate $1/\Delta_n^{1/4}$: the choice (3.1) is optimal, in the sense that it allows us to have the fastest possible rate by a balance between the involved "statistical error" which is of order $1/\sqrt{k_n}$, and the variation of c_t over the interval $[t,t+k_n\Delta_n]$, which is of order $\sqrt{k_n\Delta_n}$ because c_t is an Itô semimartingale (and even when it jumps), see [1, 6].

By Theorem 9.4.1 of [6], one also knows that

$$V(g)_t^n:=\Delta_n\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}g(\widehat{c}_i^n)\ \overset{\text{u.c.p.}}{\Longrightarrow}\ V(g)_t:=\int_0^t g(c_s)\,ds \tag{3.3}$$

(convergence in probability, uniform over each compact interval; by convention $\sum_{i=a}^b v_i=0$ whenever $b<a$), as soon as the function g on $\mathcal{M}_d^+$ is continuous with $|g(x)|\leq K(1+\|x\|^p)$ for some constants K,p, and under either one of the following three conditions:

- (A-0) holds, X is continuous, $\frac{u_n}{\Delta_n^{\varepsilon}}\to\infty$ for some $\varepsilon<\frac{1}{2}$ (for example $u_n\equiv\infty$)
- (A-2) holds and $p\leq 1$ and $u_n\asymp\Delta_n^{\varpi}$ for some $\varpi\in\left(0,\frac{1}{2}\right)$ (3.4)
- (A-r) holds for some $r\in[0,2)$ and $p>1$ and $u_n\asymp\Delta_n^{\varpi}$ for some $\varpi\in\left[\frac{p-1}{2p-r},\frac{1}{2}\right)$.

Notice the upper limit in the definition (3.3) of $V^n(g)_t$: this is to ensure that $V^n(g)_t$ is actually computable from the observations up to the time horizon t. Note also that when X is continuous, the truncation in (3.2) is useless: one may use (3.2) with $u_n\equiv\infty$, which reduces to (1.2) in the one-dimensional case.

Now, we want to determine at which rate the convergence (3.3) takes place. This amounts to proving an associated Central Limit Theorem. Under the restriction $r < 1$ and an appropriate choice of the truncation levels, such a CLT is available for $V(g)^n$, with the rate $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$, but the limit exhibits a bias term.

As a matter of fact, the bias results from two factors. The first one is due to a border effect: the formula giving $V^n(g)_t$ contains $[t/\Delta_n] - k_n + 1$ summands only, whereas the natural (unfeasible) approximation $\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} g(c_{(i-1)\Delta_n})$ contains $[t/\Delta_n]$ summands. The sum of the lacking k_n summands is of order of magnitude $(k_n - 1)\Delta_n$, which goes to 0 and thus does not impair consistency, but it creates an obvious bias after normalization by $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$. Removing this source of bias is straightforward: since $g(c_s)$ is "under-represented" when s is close to 0 or to t, we replace $V^n(g)_t$ by

$$V'(g)^n_t = \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} g(\widehat{c}^n_i) + \frac{(k_n-1)\Delta_n}{2}\big(g(\widehat{c}^n_1) + g(\widehat{c}^n_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1})\big). \tag{3.5}$$

Of course, other weighted averages of $g(\widehat{c}^n_i)$ for i close to 0 or to $[t/\Delta_n] - k_n + 1$ would be possible.

The second source of bias is more subtle, as seen from its specific form given in our first theorem below. Below, g is a smooth function on $\mathcal{M}_d^+$, and the two first partial derivatives are denoted as $\partial_{jk}g$ and $\partial^2_{jk,lm}g$, since any $x \in \mathcal{M}_d^+$ has d^2 components x^{jk}. The family of all partial derivatives of order j is simply denoted as $\partial^j g$.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume (A-r) for some $r < 1$. Let g be a C^3 function on $\mathcal{M}_d^+$ such that*

$$\|\partial^j g(x)\| \le K(1 + \|x\|^{p-j}), \qquad j = 0,1,2,3 \tag{3.6}$$

for some constants $K > 0$, $p \ge 3$. Either suppose that X is continuous and $u_n/\Delta_n^{\varepsilon} \to \infty$ for some $\varepsilon < 1/2$ (for example, $u_n \equiv \infty$, so there is no truncation at all), or suppose that

$$u_n \asymp \Delta_n^{\varpi}, \qquad \frac{2p-1}{2(2p-r)} \le \varpi < \frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.7}$$

Then we have the finite-dimensional (in time) stable convergence in law

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\left(V'(g)^n_t - V(g)_t\right) \overset{\mathcal{L}_{f-s}}{\longrightarrow} A^{(c),1}_t + A^{(c),2}_t + A^{(d)}_t + Z_t, \tag{3.8}$$

where Z is a process defined on an extension $(\widetilde{\Omega}, \widetilde{\mathcal{F}}, (\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t\ge0}, \widetilde{\mathbb{P}})$ of $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\ge0}, \mathbb{P})$, which conditionally on $\mathcal{F}$ is a continuous centered Gaussian martingale with variance

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\big((Z_t)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}\big) = \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d} \int_0^t \partial_{jk}g(c_s)\,\partial_{lm}g(c_s)\,\big(c^{jl}_s c^{km}_s + c^{jm}_s c^{kl}_s\big)\,ds, \tag{3.9}$$

and where

$$\begin{aligned} A^{(c),1}_t &= \tfrac{1}{2\theta} \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d} \int_0^t \partial^2_{jk,lm}g(c_s)\,\big(c^{jl}_s c^{km}_s + c^{jm}_s c^{kl}_s\big)\,ds \\ A^{(c),2}_t &= -\tfrac{\theta}{12} \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d} \int_0^t \partial^2_{jk,lm}g(c_s)\,\widetilde{c}^{jk,lm}_s\,ds \\ A^{(d)}_t &= \theta \sum_{s\le t} G(c_{s-}, \Delta c_s). \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$G(x,y) = \int_0^1 \big(g(x+wy) - (1-w)g(x) - wg(x+y)\big)\,dw \tag{3.11}$$

(Note that $|G(x,y)| \leq K(1+\|x\|)^p\,\|y\|^2$, so the sum defining $A_t^{(d)}$ is absolutely convergent.) When c_t is continuous we have $A_t^{(d)} = 0$ and it can be proved that the convergence (3.8) also takes place in the "functional" sense, but it is impossible to have functional convergence when c_t has jumps because the limit in (3.8) has jumps, whereas the jumps of the left side are vanishing as $n \to \infty$: this prevents the convergence for the Skorokhod topology.

Remark 3.2 The bias has three parts:

1) The first part $A^{(c),1}$ is continuous in time and is present even for the toy model $X_t = \sqrt{c}\,W_t$ with c a constant and $\Delta_n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $T = 1$. In this simple case it can be interpreted as follows: instead of taking the "optimal" $g(\widehat{c}_n)$ for estimating $g(c)$, with $\widehat{c}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X)^2$, one takes $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n g(\widehat{c}_i^n)$ with $\widehat{c}_i^n$ a "local" estimator of c. This adds a statistical error which results in a bias. Note that, even in the general case, this bias would disappear, were we taking in (3.1) the (forbidden) value $\theta = \infty$ (with still $k_n\Delta_n \to 0$, at the expense of a slower rate of convergence.

2) The second and third parts $A^{(c),2}$ and $A^{(d)}$ are respectively continuous and purely discontinuous, due to the continuous part and to the jumps of the volatility process c_t itself. These two biases disappear if we take $\theta = 0$ in (3.1) (with still $k_n \to \infty$), again a forbidden value, and again at the expense of a slower rate of convergence.

The only test function g for which all these biases disappear is the identity $g(x) = x$. This is because, in this case, and up to border terms, $V'(g)_t^n$ is nothing but the realized quadratic variation itself and the spot estimators $\widehat{c}_i^n$ actually merge together and disappear as such.

Remark 3.3 Observe that (3.7) implies $r < 1$. This restriction is not a surprise, since one needs $r \leq 1$ in order to estimate the integrated volatility by the (truncated) realized volatility, with a rate of convergence $1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$. When $r = 1$ it is likely that the CLT still holds fore an appropriate choice of the sequence u_n, and with another additional bias, see e.g. [7] for a slightly different context. Here we let this borderline case aside.

3.2 Estimation of the Bias.

Now we proceed to "remove" the bias, which means subtracting consistent estimators for the bias from $V'(g)_t^n$. First, $A^{(c),1} = \frac{1}{\theta}\,V(h)$ for the test function h given on $\mathcal{M}_d^+$ by

$$h(x) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^d \partial^2_{jk,lm} g(x)\,\big(x^{jl}x^{km} + x^{jm}x^{kl}\big). \tag{3.12}$$

Therefore

$$A_t^{n,c,1} = \frac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,V(h)_t^n \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ A_t^{(c),1}. \tag{3.13}$$

(One can also use $V'(h)_t^n$, of course.)

Secondly, the term $A_t^{(c),2}$ involves the volatility of the volatility, for which estimators have been provided in the one-dimensional case by M. Vetter in [8]; namely, if $d=1$ and under suitable technical assumptions (slightly stronger than here), *plus* the continuity of X_t and c_t, he proves that

$$\frac{3}{2k_n}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-2k_n+1}(\widehat{c}^n_{i+k_n}-\widehat{c}^n_i)^2$$

converges to $\int_0^t \left(\widetilde{c}_s+\frac{6}{\theta^2}\,(c_s)^2\right)ds$. Of course, we need to modify this estimator here, in order to include the function $\partial^2 g$ in the limit and account for the possibilities of having $d\geq 2$ and having jumps in X. We propose to take

$$A_t^{n,c,2}=-\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{8}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-2k_n+1}\ \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(\widehat{c}^n_i)\,(\widehat{c}^{n,jk}_{i+k_n}-\widehat{c}^{n,jk}_i)\,(\widehat{c}^{n,lm}_{i+k_n}-\widehat{c}^{n,lm}_i). \tag{3.14}$$

When X and c are continuous one may expect the convergence to $A_t^{(c),2}-\frac{1}{2}\,A_t^{(c),1}$ (observe that $\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{4}\sim\frac{3}{2k_n}\,\frac{\theta}{12}$), and one may expect the same when X jumps, because in (3.2) the truncation basically eliminates the jumps of X, and when c is still continuous. In contrast, when c jumps, the limit should rather be related to the "full" quadratic variation of c, and indeed we have:

Theorem 3.4 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, for all* $t\geq 0$ *we have*

$$A_t^{n,c,2}\ \stackrel{\mathbb{P}}{\longrightarrow}\ -\frac{1}{2}\,A_t^{(c),1}+A^{(c),2}+A_t^{\prime(d)}, \tag{3.15}$$

where

$$A_t^{\prime(d)}=\theta\sum_{s\leq t}G'(c_{s-},\Delta c_s) \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$G'(x,y)=-\frac{1}{8}\sum_{j,k,l,m}\int_0^1\left(\partial^2_{jk,lm}\,g(x)+\partial^2_{jk,lm}\,g(x+(1-w)y)\right)w^2\,y^{jk}\,y^{lm}\,dw. \tag{3.17}$$

At this stage, it remains to find consistent estimators for $A_t^{(d)}-A_t^{\prime(d)}$, which has the form

$$A_t^{(d)}-A_t^{\prime(d)}=\theta\sum_{s\leq t}G''(c_{s-},\Delta c_s),\quad \text{where}\ \ G''=G-G'.$$

More generally, we aim to estimating

$$\mathcal{V}(F)_t=\sum_{s\leq t}F(c_{s-},\Delta c_s), \tag{3.18}$$

at least when the function F on $\mathcal{M}_d^+\times\mathcal{M}_d$, where $\mathcal{M}_d$ is the set of all $d\times d$ matrices, is C^1 and $|F(x,y)|\leq K\|y\|^2$ uniformly in x within any compact set, as is the function G'' above.

The solution to this problem is not as simple as it might appear at first glance. We first truncate from below, taking any sequence u'_n of truncation levels satisfying

$$u'_n \to 0, \qquad \frac{u'_n}{\Delta_n^{\varpi'}} \to \infty \quad \text{for some } \ \varpi' \in \Big(0, \frac{1}{8}\Big) \tag{3.19}$$

Second, we resort on the following trick. Since $\widehat{c}_i^n$ is "close" to the average of c_t over the interval $(i\Delta_n, (i+k_n)\Delta_n]$, we (somehow wrongly) pretend that, for all j:

$$\begin{gathered} \exists s \in ((j-1)k_n\Delta_n, jk_n\Delta_n] \ \text{ with } \ \|\Delta c_s\| > u'_n \ \Leftrightarrow \ \|\widehat{c}^n_{jk_n} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-2)k_n}\| > u'_n \\ \Delta c_s \sim \widehat{c}^n_{jk_n} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-2)k_n}, \quad \|\widehat{c}^n_{(j-1)k_n} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-3)k_n}\| \bigvee \|\widehat{c}^n_{(j+1)k_n} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-1)k_n}\| < \|\widehat{c}^n_{jk_n} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-2)k_n}\|. \end{gathered} \tag{3.20}$$

The condition (3.19) implies that for n large enough there is at most one jump of size bigger than u'_n in each interval $(i-1)\Delta_n, (i-1+k_n)\Delta_n]$ within $[0,t]$, and no two consecutive intervals of this form contain such jumps. Despite this, the statement above is of course not true, the main reason being that $\widehat{c}_i^n$ and c_i^n do not exactly agree. However it is "true enough" to allow for the next estimators to be consistent for $\mathcal{V}(F)_t$:

$$\begin{gathered} \mathcal{V}(F)^n_t = \textstyle\sum_{j=3}^{[t/k_n\Delta_n]-3} F(\widehat{c}^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}, \delta^n_j\widehat{c})\, 1_{\{\|\delta^n_{j-1}\widehat{c}\| \vee \|\delta^n_{j+1}\widehat{c}\| \vee u'_n < \|\delta^n_j\widehat{c}\|\}}, \\ \text{where } \ \delta^n_j\widehat{c} = \widehat{c}^n_{jk_n+1} - \widehat{c}^n_{(j-2)k_n+1}. \end{gathered} \tag{3.21}$$

Since this is a sum of approximately $[t/k_n\Delta_n]$ terms, the rate of convergence of $\mathcal{V}(F)^n_t$ toward $\mathcal{V}(F)_t$ is law, probably $1/\Delta_n^{1/4}$ only. However, here we are looking for consistent estimators, and the rate is not of concern to us. Note that, again, the upper limit in the sum above is chosen in such a way that $\mathcal{V}(F)^n_t$ is computable on the basis of the observations within the interval $[0,t]$.

Theorem 3.5 *Assume all hypotheses of Theorem 3.1, and let F be a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfying, with the same $p \geq 3$ as in (3.7),*

$$|F(x,y)| \leq K(1 + \|x\| + \|y\|)^{p-2}\, \|y\|^2. \tag{3.22}$$

Then for all $t \geq 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{V}(F)^n_t \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \ \mathcal{V}(F)_t. \tag{3.23}$$

3.3 An Unbiased Central Limit Theorem.

At this stage, we can set, with the notation (3.12), (3.13), (3.14) and (3.21), and also (3.11) and (3.17) for G and G':

$$\overline{V}(g)^n_t = V'(g)^n_t - \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\Big(\frac{3}{2}\, A^{n,c,1}_t + A^{n,c,2}_t\Big) - k_n\Delta_n\, \mathcal{V}(G - G')^n_t. \tag{3.24}$$

We then have the following, which is a straightforward consequence of the three previous theorems and of $k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n} \to \theta$, plus the fact that the function $G - G'$ satisfies (3.22) when g satisfies (3.6):

Theorem 3.6 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, and with Z as in this theorem, for all $t \geq 0$ we have the finite-dimensional stable convergence in law*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,(\overline{V}(g)^n_t - V(g)_t) \ \stackrel{\mathcal{L}_{f-s}}{\longrightarrow}\ Z_t. \tag{3.25}$$

Note that θ no longer explicitly appears in this statement, so one can replace (3.1) by the weaker statement

$$k_n \ \asymp\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \tag{3.26}$$

(this is easily seen by taking subsequences n_l such that $k_{n_l}\sqrt{\Delta_{n_l}}$ converge to an arbitrary limit in $(0,\infty)$).

It is simple to make this CLT "feasible", that is usable in practice for determining a confidence interval for $V(g)_t$ at any time $t > 0$. Indeed, we can define the following function on $\mathcal{M}_d^+$:

$$\overline{h}(x) = \sum_{j,k,l,m=1}^{d} \partial_{jk}\, g(x)\, \partial_{lm}\, g(x)\, \big(x^{jl}x^{km} + x^{jm}x^{kl}\big). \tag{3.27}$$

We then have $V(\overline{h})^n \stackrel{\text{u.c.p.}}{\Longrightarrow} V(\overline{h})$, whereas $V(\overline{h})_t$ is the right hand side of (3.8). Then we readily deduce:

Corollary 3.7 *Under the assumptions of the previous theorem, for any $t > 0$ we have the following stable convergence in law, where Y is an $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$ variable:*

$$\frac{\overline{V}(g)^n_t - V(g)_t}{\sqrt{\Delta_n\, V(\overline{h})^n_t}} \ \stackrel{\mathcal{L}-s}{\longrightarrow} Y, \quad \text{in restriction to the set } \{V(\overline{h})_t > 0\}, \tag{3.28}$$

Finally, coming back to optimality, the following gives two very small steps toward optimality. For simplicity we restrict our attention to the one-dimensional case $d = 1$.

Theorem 3.8 *Let $d = 1$ and g be a C^3 function on $\mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying (3.6) and which is strictly increasing, or strictly decreasing.*

a) For the parametric model $X_t = \sigma W_t$, where $c_t = \sigma_t^2 = c$ is a constant (the toy example of Introduction), for any $t > 0$ the estimators $\overline{V}(g)^n_t$ are asymptotically efficient (in Le Cam's sense) for estimating the number $tg(c)$.

b) Let $(T^n_t)_{n\geq 1}$ be another sequence of estimators, with T^n_t being a function of $(X_{i\Delta_n} : 0 \leq i \leq [t/\Delta_n])$, and such that for any X satisfying (A-0) and continous, the variables $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}(T^n_t - V(g)_t)$ converge stably in law to a limit Z'_t, defined on an extension of the space, and with a conditional variance of the form

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}((Z'_t)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}) \ = \int_0^t H(c_s)\, ds \tag{3.29}$$

for some nonnegative Borel function H. Then necessarily $H \geq \overline{h}$, as given by (3.27), and in particular

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}((Z'_t)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}) \ \geq\ \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}((Z_t)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}). \tag{3.30}$$

In particular, the estimators $U^n(f)_t$ given in (1.1) for estimating $g(x) = \mathbb{E}(f(\sqrt{x}\,U))$ have always an asymptotic variance bigger than or equal to the variance (3.9).

There is another way in which the estimators $\overline{V}(g)^n_t$ are optimal, in the sense that the Hajek *convolution theorem* holds under appropriate assumptions. More specifically, let $\mathcal{S}$ be some subclass of the class of all semimartingales X satisfying (A-r). Let $t > 0$. The estimators $\overline{V}(g)^n_t$ are asymptotically efficient in the convolution theorem sense and within $\mathcal{S}$ if, for any sequence (T^n_t) of estimators which are functions of $(X_{i\Delta_n} : 0 \leq i \leq [t/\Delta_n])$ (as above) and such that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\big(T^n_t - V(g)_t)\big)$ converges in law, whatever X in the class $\mathcal{S}$, then for each X in $\mathcal{S}$ the limiting variable Z'_t of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}(T^n_t - V(g)_t)$ can be realized as $Z_t + Z''_t$, where Z_t is the limiting process in (3.25) and the variable Z''_t is independent of Z_t conditionally on $\mathcal{F}$.

Then (a) above yields efficiency of $\overline{V}(g)^n_t$ in this sense for the class $\mathcal{S}$ of all $X_t = \sigma W_t$ for $\sigma > 0$ arbitrary. But efficiency also holds in a much wider class, as been shown in [2]: namely, for the class $\mathcal{S}$ of all one-dimensional continuous X such that the volatility σ has the form $\sigma_t = f(t, X_t, Y_t)$, where Y_t is another Itô semimartingale independent of the Brownian motion driving X, plus some smoothness on the coefficients of the equations.

So far, however, a "general" theory of optimality in our non-parametric context seems still out of reach.

Remark 3.9 For a given function g, the variables $V(g)^n_t$ and $V'(g)^n_t$ are easy to compute on the basis of the observed increments $\Delta^n_i X$, and the same is true of the de-biasing terms $A^{n,c,1}_t$ and $A^{n,c,2}_t$. The de-biasing term $\mathcal{V}(G - G')^n_t$, which occurs when c has jumps, is also straightforward to compute, as long as one has an explicit expression for $G - G'$. In some instances $G - G'$ has a closed form expression, for example when g is a linear combination of functions of the form $\prod_{j=1}^p x^{m_j q_j}$ for any choice of the indices m_j and q_j between 1 and d (repeated indices are of course possible). Otherwise, one may always rely upon numerical integration to compute $(G - G')(x, y)$ for the observed values $x = \widehat{c}^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}$ and $y = \delta^n_j \widehat{c}$.

Example 3.10 (Quarticity) Suppose $d = 1$ and take $g(x) = x^2$, so we want tho estimate the quarticity $\int_0^t c_s^2\,ds$. In this case we have

$$h(x) = 2x^2, \qquad G(x,y) = 0, \qquad G'(x,y) = -\frac{y^2}{6}, \qquad \overline{h}(x) = 8x^4.$$

Then the "optimal" estimator for the quarticity is

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_n\big(1 - \tfrac{3}{k_n}\big) \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} (\widehat{c}^n_i)^2 + \tfrac{\Delta_n}{4} \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-2k_n+1} (\widehat{c}^n_{i+k_n} - \widehat{c}^n_i)^2 \\ + \tfrac{(k_n-1)\Delta_n}{2}\big((\widehat{c}^n_1)^2 + (\widehat{c}^n_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1})^2\big) \\ - \tfrac{k_n \Delta_n}{6} \textstyle\sum_{j=3}^{[t/k_n\Delta_n]-3} (\delta^n_j \widehat{c})^2\, 1_{\{\|\delta^n_{j-1}\widehat{c}\| \vee \|\delta^n_{j+1}\widehat{c}\| \vee u'_n < \|\delta^n_j \widehat{c}\|\}},\end{aligned}$$

the last term being unnecessary when one knows that c_t is continuous.

The asymptotic variance is $8\int_0^t c_s^4\,ds$, to be compared with the asymptotic variance of the more usual estimators $\frac{1}{3\Delta_n}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]}(\Delta^n_i X)^4$, which is $\frac{32}{3}\int_0^t c_s^4\,ds$.

4 Proofs

4.1 A Localization Procedure.

We start by showing that one can replace (A-r) by the following stronger assumption:

Assumption (SA-r): We have (A-r) and moreover:

(i) $\tau_1 = \infty$ identically, the five processes $c, b, \widetilde{b}, \widetilde{c}, \widetilde{c}'$ and the two functions $\delta, \widetilde{\delta}$ are uniformly bounded;

(ii) for any $a > 0$ there is a non-random integer N_a such that all six càdlàg processes b_t, $\widetilde{b}_t$, c_t, $\widetilde{c}_t$, $\widetilde{c}'_t$, and $\widetilde{\gamma}_t = \int \|\widetilde{\delta}(t+,z)\|^2\, \lambda(dz)$ have at most N_a jumps with size bigger than a (since $\|\widetilde{\delta}(\omega,t,z)\|^2 \wedge 1 \leq J(z)$ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ is bounded by (i), the process $\widetilde{\gamma}_t$ is finite-valued and càdlàg).□

The following localization lemma looks familiar for the sort of problems at hand. However there are two special requirements here: the condition (ii) above, and the connection between X and c, which we have to maintain when we localize. For these reasons we provide a (sketchy) proof.

Lemma 4.1 *It is sufficient to prove the four theorems 3.1, 3.4 3.5 and 3.6 under the stronger assumption (SA-r).*

Proof. Denote by (SA'-r) the assumption according to which (A-r) and (i) of (SA-r) hold. By the usual localization procedure and a two-steps argument, it is enough to show that if X satisfies (A-r) (resp. (SA'-r)), there is a (not necessarily increasing) sequence S_n of stopping times such that $S_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \infty$ and a sequence X^n of processes satisfying (SA'-r) (resp. (SA-r), such that $X_t = X^n_t$ for all $t < S_n$.

Step 1) We start with X satisfying (A-r). Set $\psi_n(x) = 1 \wedge \big(2 - \frac{x}{2n}\big)^+$ for $x \geq 0$, and $f_n(x) = x\psi_n(\|x\|)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\widetilde{f}_n(y) = y\psi_n(\|y\|)$ if $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$, and

$$S_n = \tau_n \bigwedge \inf\big(t : \|X_t\| + \|c_t\| + \|b_t\| + \|\widetilde{b}_t\| + \|\widetilde{c}_t\| > n\big).$$

First, we define a new process c^n as

$$c^n_t \;=\; c_{t\wedge S_n} - \sum_{s \leq t\wedge S_n} \big(\Delta c_s - \widetilde{f}_n(\Delta c_s)\big).$$

It satisfies (2.2) with the new coefficients

$$\widetilde{b}^n_t = \widetilde{b}_t\, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}, \qquad \widetilde{\sigma}^n_t = \widetilde{\sigma}_t\, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}, \qquad \widetilde{\delta}^n(t,z) = \widetilde{f}_n(\widetilde{\delta}(t,z))\, 1_{\{t\leq S_n\}}.$$

By construction the processes $\widetilde{b}^n_t$ and $\widetilde{c}^n_t = \widetilde{\sigma}^n_t \widetilde{\sigma}^{*n}_t$ are càdlàg with norms bounded by n, and $\widetilde{\delta}^n(t,z)$ is càglàd in t and satisfies $\|\widetilde{\delta}^n\| \leq 2n$ and $\|\widetilde{\delta}^n(t,z)\|^2 \wedge 1 \leq J_n(z)$. Moreover $\|\Delta c_t\| \leq 2n$ for $t < S_n$ and $\widetilde{f}_n(y) = y$ when $\|y\| \leq 2n$, implying that $c^n_t = c_t$ for $t < S_n$. When $t \geq S_n$ we have $c^n_t = c_{S_n-} + \Delta c_{S_n} \psi_n(\|\Delta c_{S_n}\|)$; since both c_{S_n-} and $c_{S_n-} + \Delta c_{S_n}$

are $\mathcal{M}_d^+$-valued and $0 \leq \psi_n \leq 1$, one easily deduces that $c_t^n = c_{S_n}^n$ is also $\mathcal{M}_d^+$-valued. Hence, taking any $\mathcal{F}_{S_n}$-measurable version of the square-root $\widehat{\sigma}_{S_n}^n$ of $c_{S_n}^n$, one can define the following process σ^n, which satisfies $\sigma_t^n \sigma_t^{n*} = c_t^n$ for all t:

$$\sigma_t^n = \sigma_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}} + \widehat{\sigma}_{S_n}^n \, 1_{\{t \geq S_n\}}.$$

We can now define X^n by (2.1), with the coefficients

$$b_t^n = b_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}, \qquad \sigma_t^n \ \text{ as above}, \qquad \delta^n(t,z) = f_n(\delta(t,z)) \, 1_{\{t \leq S_n\}}$$

(note that X^n is not freezed at time S_n, since its continuous martingale part continues to evolve as a Brownian motion after this time). Exactly as above, the process b_t^n is càdlàg bounded by n, and $\delta^n(t,z)$ is càglàd bounded by $2n$ and $\|\delta^n(t,z)\|^r \wedge 1 \leq J_n(z)$, whereas c_t^n is càdlàg and bounded by $3n$ by construction. Finally, the density $\widetilde{c}'^n = \sigma^n \widetilde{\sigma}^{n,*}$ of the quadratic covariation of the continuous martingale parts of X^n and c^n is bounded by n (because $\|\widetilde{c}'^n\| \leq \sqrt{\|c^n\| \, \|\widetilde{c}^n\|}$ by Kunita-Watanabe inequality) and càdlàg, since it equals $\widetilde{c}_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}$.

All this implies that the process X^n satisfies (SA'-r) (with J_1 for X^n being the function J_n associated with X). Moreover we have seen that $c_t^n = c_t$ when $t < S_n$ and, again as previously, $\|\Delta X_t\| \leq 2n$ and thus $f_n(\Delta X_t) = \Delta X_t$ if $t < S_n$, implying $X_t^n = X_t$ if $t < S_n$. Since further $S_n \uparrow \infty$ we have proved that we can replace (A-r) by (SA'-r).

Step 2) Now we suppose that X satisfies (SA'-r), so the six processes $b_t, \widetilde{b}_t, c_t, \widetilde{c}_t, \widetilde{c}'_t, \widetilde{\gamma}_t$ are all càdlàg. For each $a > 0$ we let $T_1^a, T_2^a, \cdots$ be the successive times at which at least one of these six processes has a jump with size bigger than a. Note that $T_j^a \leq T_j^{a'}$ if $a' > a$. For all $n, j \geq 1$ there is an integer $l(n,j)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(T_{l(n,j)}^{1/j} \leq n) \leq 2^{-j}/n$. Then $S_n = \inf(T_{l(n,j)}^{1/j} : j = 1, 2, \cdots)$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}(S_n < n) \leq \frac{1}{n}$ and thus $S_n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \infty$.

At this point, for $n \geq 1$ we first define $c_t^n = c_{t \wedge S_n}$, which satisfies (2.2) with

$$\widetilde{b}_t^n = \widetilde{b}_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}, \qquad \widetilde{\sigma}_t^n = \widetilde{\sigma}_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}, \qquad \widetilde{\delta}^n(t,z) = \widetilde{\delta}(t,z) \, 1_{\{t \leq S_n\}}.$$

We also set $\sigma_t^n = \sigma_{t \wedge S_n}$, hence $\sigma_t^n \sigma_t^{n*} = c_t^n$ identically. Next, we define X^n by (2.1) with the coefficients $b_t^n = b_t \, 1_{\{t<S_n\}}$ and σ_t^n as above and $\delta^n = \delta$. It is easy to check that each X^n satisfies (SA-r), with $N_a = 1 + l(n,j)$ if $\frac{1}{j} \leq a < \frac{1}{j-1}$, and that $X_t^n = X_t$ if $t \leq S_n$, so the proof is complete. $\square$

In view of this lemma, we will assume below that X satisfies (SA-r). In the sequel, all constants are denoted by K, and they vary from to line. They may implicitly depend on the process X. When they depend on an additional parameter p, we write K_p.

In particular, we have for some λ-integrable nonnegative function J on E:

$$\|b\|, \ \|\widetilde{b}\|, \ \|c\|, \ \|\widetilde{c}\|, \ \|\widetilde{c}'\|, \ J \ \leq \ K, \quad \|\delta(\omega,t,z)\|^r \leq J(z), \quad \|\widetilde{\delta}(\omega,t,z)\|^2 \leq J(z), \tag{4.1}$$

For convenience, we will slightly modify our notation for the drift processes. Indeed, since δ and $\widetilde{\delta}$ are bounded, we rewrite (2.1) and (2.2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= X_0 + \int_0^t b_s \, ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s \, dW_s + \int_0^t \int_E \delta(s,z) \, (\mu - \nu)(ds,dz) \\ c_t &= c_0 + \int_0^t \widetilde{b}_s \, ds + \int_0^t \widetilde{\sigma}_s \, dW_s + \int_0^t \int_E \widetilde{\delta}(s,z) \, (\mu - \nu)(ds,dz). \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

This amounts to replacing b in (2.1) by the bounded càdlàg process $b_t+\int_E \kappa'(\delta(t+,z))\,\lambda(dz)$, and likewise for $\widetilde{b}$, and these new versions of b and $\widetilde{b}$ still satisfy (4.1). As a matter of fact, below we will most often use the "continuous part" of X, which is

$$X'_t = X_0 + \int_0^t b_s\,ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s\,dW_s. \tag{4.3}$$

We end this subsection with well known estimates for X' and c, under (4.1) and for $s,t\geq 0$ and $q\geq 0$:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{w\in[0,s]}\|X'_{t+w}-X'_t\|^q\mid\mathcal{F}_t\big)\leq K_q\,s^{q/2}, & \|\mathbb{E}(X'_{t+s}-X'_t\mid\mathcal{F}_s)\|\leq Ks \\ \mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{w\in[0,s]}\|c_{t+w}-c_t\|^q\mid\mathcal{F}_t\big)\leq K_q\,s^{1\wedge(q/2)}, & \|\mathbb{E}(c_{t+s}-c_t\mid\mathcal{F}_s)\|\leq Ks. \end{array} \tag{4.4}$$

4.2 An Auxiliary Result on Itô Semimartingales

In this subsection we give some simple estimates for a d-dimensional semimartingale

$$Y_t = \int_0^t b^Y_s\,ds + \int_0^t \sigma^Y_s\,dW_s + \int_0^t\int_E \delta^Y(s,z)\,(\mu-\nu)(ds,dz)$$

on some space $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0},\mathbb{P})$, which may be different from the one on which X is defined, as well as W and μ, but we still suppose that the intensity measure ν is the same. Note that $Y_0=0$ here. We assume that for some constant A and function J^Y we have, with $c^Y=\sigma^Y\sigma^{Y,*}$:

$$\|b^Y\|\leq A,\ \|c^Y\|\leq A^2,\quad \|\delta^Y(\omega,t,z)\|^2\leq J^Y(z)\leq A^2,\quad \int_E J^Y(z)\,\lambda(dz)\leq A^2. \tag{4.5}$$

The compensator of the quadratic variation of Y is of the form $\int_0^t \overline{c}^Y_s\,ds$, where $\overline{c}^Y_t = c^Y_t + \int_E \delta^Y(t,z)\,\delta(t,z)^*\,\lambda(dz)$. Moreover, if the process c^Y is itself an Itô semimartingale, the quadratic covariation of the continuous martingale parts of Y and c^Y is also of the form $\int_0^t \widetilde{c}'^Y_s\,ds$ for some process $\widetilde{c}'^Y$, necessarily bounded if both Y and c^Y satisfy (4.5) (and, if $Y=X$, we have $c^Y=c$ and $\widetilde{c}'^Y=\widetilde{c}'$).

Finally we associate with any process Z the variables

$$\eta(Z)_t = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{s\leq t}\|Z_s-Z_0\|^2\mid\mathcal{F}_0\big)}. \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.2 *Below we assume (4.5), and the constant K only depends on A.*

a) We have for $t\in[0,1]$:

$$\begin{array}{l} \big\|\mathbb{E}(Y_t\mid\mathcal{F}_0)-tb^Y_0\big\|\leq t\,\eta(b^Y)_t\leq Kt \\ \big|\mathbb{E}(Y^j_t\,Y^m_t\mid\mathcal{F}_0)-t\overline{c}^{Y,jm}_0\big|\leq Kt(t+\sqrt{t}\,\eta(b^Y)_t+\eta(\overline{c}^Y)_t)\leq Kt, \end{array} \tag{4.7}$$

and if further $\|\mathbb{E}(\overline{c}^Y_t-\overline{c}^Y_0\mid\mathcal{F}_0)\|\leq A^2t$ for all t, we also have

$$\big|\mathbb{E}(Y^j_t\,Y^m_t\mid\mathcal{F}_0)-t\overline{c}^{Y,jm}_0\big|\leq 2\,t^{3/2}(2A^2\sqrt{t}+A\eta(b^Y)_t)\leq Kt^{3/2}. \tag{4.8}$$

b) When Y is continuous, and if $\mathbb{E}(\|\overline{c}_t^Y - \overline{c}_0^Y\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq A^4 t$ for all t, we have

$$\big|\mathbb{E}\big(Y_t^j\, Y_t^k\, Y_t^l\, Y_t^m \mid \mathcal{F}_0\big) - t^2(c_0^{Y,jk}c_0^{Y,lm} + c_0^{Y,jl}c_0^{Y,km} + c_0^{Y,jm}c_0^{Y,kl})\big| \leq Kt^{5/2}. \tag{4.9}$$

c) When c^Y is a (possibly discontinuous) semimartingale satisfying the same conditions (4.5) as Y, and if Y itself is continuous, we have

$$\big|\mathbb{E}\big((Y_t^j\, Y_t^k - tc_0^{Y,jk})(c_t^{Y,lm} - c_0^{Y,lm}) \mid \mathcal{F}_0\big) \leq Kt^{3/2}(\sqrt{t} + \eta(\widehat{c}'^{Y})_t). \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. a) The first part of (4.7) follows by taking the $\mathcal{F}_0$-conditional expectation in the decomposition $Y_t = M_t + tb_0^Y + \int_0^t (b_s^Y - b_0^Y)\, ds$, where M is a d-dimensional martingale with $M_0 = 0$. For the second part, we deduce from Itô's formula that $Y^j Y^m$ is the sum of a martingale vanishing at 0 and of

$$b_0^j \int_0^t Y_s^m\, ds + b_0^m \int_0^t Y_s^j\, ds + \int_0^t Y_s^m (b_s^j - b_0^j)\, ds + \int_0^t Y_s^j (b_s^m - b_0^m)\, ds + \overline{c}_0^{Y,jm} t + \int_0^t (\overline{c}_s^{Y,jm} - \overline{c}_0^{Y,jm})\, ds.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(\|Y_t\| \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq KA\sqrt{t}$, as in (4.4), we deduce the second part of (4.7) and also (4.8) by taking again the conditional expectation and by using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the first part.

b) For any indices $j_1, \cdots, j_4$ Itô's formula yields a martingale M vanishing at 0 such that

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\prod_{l=1}^4 Y_t^{j_l} \;&=\; M_t + \textstyle\sum_{l=1}^p \int_0^t b_s^{Y,j_l} \prod_{1\leq m\leq p, m\neq l} Y_s^{j_m}\, ds \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2} \textstyle\sum_{1\leq l,l'\leq d, l\neq l'} c_0^{Y,j_l j_{l'}} \int_0^t \prod_{1\leq m\leq 4, m\neq l,l'} Y_s^{j_m}\, ds \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2} \textstyle\sum_{1\leq l,l'\leq d, l\neq l'} \int_0^t (c_s^{Y,j_l j_{l'}} - c_0^{Y,j_l j_{l'}}) \prod_{1\leq m\leq 4, m\neq l,l'} Y_s^{j_m}\, ds.\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

We have used here the continuity of Y, which also implies $\mathbb{E}(\|Y_t\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq K_q A^q\, t^{q/2}$ for all $q \geq 0$. Again, we take the $\mathcal{F}_0$-conditional expectation and we deal with the second, the third, and the last term in the right side above by Fubini's theorem and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. For the fourth term we use (4.7), and a simple calculation yields the result.

c) We have $Y_t^j Y_t^k - tc_0^{Y,jk} = B_t + M_t$ and $c_t^{Y,lm} - c_0^{Y,lm} = B'_t + M'_t$, with M and M' martingales (M is continuous). The processes B, B', $\langle M, M\rangle$, $\langle M', M'\rangle$ and $\langle M, M'\rangle$ are absolutely continuous, with densities $\overline{b}_s$, $\overline{b}'_s$, h_s, h'_s and h''_s satisfying, by (4.6) for Y and c^Y:

$$|\overline{b}_s| \leq 2\|Y_s\|\, \|b_s^Y\| + \|c_s^Y - c_0^Y\|, \quad |\overline{b}'_s| \leq K, \quad |h_s| \leq K\|Y_s\|^2, \quad |h'_s| \leq K,$$

whereas $h''_s = Y_s^j \widehat{c}'^{Y,k,lm} + Y_s^k \widehat{c}'^{Y,j;lm}$. As seen before, $\mathbb{E}(\|Y_t\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq K_q t^{q/2}$ for all q, and $\mathbb{E}(\|c_t^Y - c_0^Y\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq Kt$. This yields $\mathbb{E}(B_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq Kt^3$ and $\mathbb{E}(M_t^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq Kt^2$. Since $|B'_t| \leq Kt$ and $\mathbb{E}(M_t'^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq Kt$, we deduce that the $\mathcal{F}_0$- conditional expectations of $B_t B'_t$ and $B_t M'_t$ and $M_t B'_t$ are smaller than Kt^2.

Finally $\mathbb{E}(M_t M'_t \mid \mathcal{F}_0) = \mathbb{E}(\langle M, M'\rangle_t \mid \mathcal{F}_0)$, and $\langle M, M'\rangle_t$ is the sum of $\widehat{c}_0'^{Y,k,lm} \int_0^t Y_s^j\, ds + \int_0^t Y_s^j (\widehat{c}_s'^{Y,k,lm} - \widehat{c}_0'^{Y,k,lm})\, ds$ and a similar term with k and j exchanged. Then using again $\mathbb{E}(\|Y_t\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_0) \leq Kt$, plus $\|\mathbb{E}(Y_t \mid \mathcal{F}_0)\| \leq Kt$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain that the above conditional expectation is smaller than $K(t^2 + t^{3/2}\eta(\widehat{c}'^{Y})_t)$. This completes the proof of (4.10). $\square$

4.3 Some Estimates.

1) It is much easier (although unfeasible in practice) to replace $\widehat{c}_i^n$ in (3.3) by the estimators based on the X', as given by (4.3). Namely, we will replace $\widehat{c}_i^n$ by the following:

$$\widehat{c}_i'^n = \frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1}\Delta_{i+j}^n X'\,\Delta_{i+j}^n X'^*.$$

The comparison between $\widehat{c}_i^n$ and $\widehat{c}_i'^n$ is based on the following consequence of Lemma 13.2.6 of [6], applied with $F(x) = x\,x^*$, so $k = 1$ and $p' = s' = 2$ and $s = 1$ and $\varepsilon = 0$ (because $r < 1$) with the notation of that lemma. Namely, we have for all $q \ge 1$ and for some sequence a_n going to 0:

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\big\|(\Delta_i^n X\,\Delta_i^n X^*)\,1_{\{\|\Delta_i^n X\|\le u_n\}} - (\Delta_i^n X'\,\Delta_i^n X'^*)\,1_{\{\|\Delta_i^n X'\|\le u_n\}}\big\|^q\big)\big| \le K_q a_n\,\Delta_n^{(2q-r)\varpi+1}.$$

Since $\mathbb{E}(\|\Delta_i^n X'\|^{2q}) \le K_q\Delta_n^q$ for any $q > 0$ by classical estimates, implying by Markov's inequality that $\mathbb{E}(\|\Delta_i^n X'\|^{2q}\,1\{\|\Delta_i^n X'\| > u_n\}) \le K\Delta_n^{q+q'(1-2\varpi)}$ for any $q' > 0$, by taking $q' > \frac{1}{1-2\varpi}$ we then easily deduce

$$\mathbb{E}\big(\|\widehat{c}_i^n - \widehat{c}_i'^n\|^q\big) \le K_q a_n\,\Delta_n^{(2q-r)\varpi+1-q}. \tag{4.12}$$

2) The jumps of c also potentially cause troubles. So we will eliminate the "big" jumps as follows. For any $\rho > 0$ we consider the subset $E_\rho = \{z : J(z) > \rho\}$, which satisfies $\lambda(E_\rho) < \infty$, and we denote by $\mathcal{G}^\rho$ the σ-field generated by the variables $\mu([0,t]\times A)$, where $t \ge 0$ and A runs through all Borel subsets of E_ρ. We let $S_1^\rho, S_2^\rho, \cdots$ be the successive jump times of the Poisson process $\mu((0,t]\times E_\rho)$, and $T(n,i,\rho)$ the smallest S_j^ρ which exceeds $(i-1)\Delta_n$, and $\Omega_{n,t,\rho}$ the set on which $S_{j+1}^\rho > t \wedge S_j^\rho + (6k_n+1)\Delta_n$ for all $j \ge 0$ (with the convention $S_0^\rho = 0$; taking $6k_n$ here instead of the more natural k_n will be needed in the proof of Theorem 3.5, and makes no difference here). All these objects are $\mathcal{G}^\rho$-measurable, and $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_{n,t,\rho}) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, for all $t, \rho > 0$.

We define the processes

$$\widetilde{b}(\rho)_t = \widetilde{b}_t - \int_{E_\rho}\widetilde{\delta}(t+,z)\,\lambda(dz), \qquad \overline{c}(\rho)_t = \widetilde{\sigma}_t\,\widetilde{\sigma}_t^* + \int_{(E_\rho)^c}\widetilde{\delta}(t+,z)\,\widetilde{\delta}(t+,z)^*\,\lambda(dz)$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} c(\rho)_t & = & c_t - \int_0^t\int_{E_\rho}\widetilde{\delta}(s,z)\,\mu(ds,dz) \;=\; c^{(1)}(\rho)_t + c^{(2)}(\rho)_t, \quad \text{where} \\ & & c^{(1)}(\rho)_t = c_0 + \int_0^t\widetilde{b}(\rho)_s\,ds + \int_0^t\widetilde{\sigma}_s\,dW_s \\ & & c^{(2)}(\rho)_t = \int_0^t\int_{(E_\rho)^c}\widetilde{\delta}(t-,z)\,(\mu-\nu)(ds,dz), \end{array} \tag{4.13}$$

so $\overline{c}(\rho)$, which is $\mathbb{R}^{d^2}\otimes\mathbb{R}^{d^2}$-valued, is the càdlàg version of the density of the predictable quadratic variation of $c(\rho)$. Moreover $\mathcal{G}^\rho = \{\emptyset,\Omega\}$ and $(\widetilde{b}(\rho), c(\rho)) = (\widetilde{b}, c)$ when ρ exceeds the bound of the function J.

By Lemma 2.1.5 and Proposition 2.1.10 in [6] applied to each components of X' and $c^{(2)}(\rho)$, plus the property $\|\widetilde{b}(\rho)\| \leq K/\rho$, for all $t \geq 0$, $s \in [0,1]$, $\rho \in (0,1]$, $q \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{w\in[0,s]} \|X'_{t+w} - X'_t\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho\big) \leq K_q\, s^{q/2} \\
\|\,\mathbb{E}(X'_{t+s} - X'_t \mid \mathcal{F}_s \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho)\| + \|\,\mathbb{E}(c(\rho)_{t+s} - c(\rho)_t \mid \mathcal{F}_s \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho)\| \leq K s \\
\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{w\in[0,s]} \|c^{(2)}(\rho)_{t+w} - c^{(2)}(\rho)_t\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho\big) \leq K_q\, \phi_\rho\, (s + s^{q/2}) \\
\mathbb{E}\big(\sup_{w\in[0,s]} \|c(\rho)_{t+w} - c(\rho)_t\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_t \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho\big) \leq K_q\big(\phi_\rho\, s + s^{q/2} + \frac{s^q}{\rho^q}\big) \leq K_{q,\rho}\, s.
\end{array} \tag{4.14}$$

where $\phi_\rho = \int_{(E_\rho)^c} J(z)\,\lambda(dz) \to 0$ as $\rho \to 0$. Note also that $\|\widetilde{b}(\rho)_t\| \leq K/\rho$.

3) For convenience, we put

$$\begin{array}{lll}
b_i^n = b_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, & c_i^n = c_{(i-1)\Delta_n} & \\
\widetilde{b}(\rho)_i^n = \widetilde{b}(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, & \overline{c}(\rho)_i^n = \overline{c}(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, & c(\rho)_i^n = c(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \\
\mathcal{F}_i^n = \mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}, & \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho} = \mathcal{F}_i^n \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho. &
\end{array} \tag{4.15}$$

All the above variables are $\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$-measurable. We also set

$$\begin{array}{l}
\eta(\rho)_{t,s} = \sup\,\big(\|Y_{t+u} - Y_t\|^2 :\ u \in [0,s],\ Y = b, \widetilde{b}(\rho), c, \overline{c}(\rho), \widetilde{c}'\big) \\
\eta(\rho)_{i,j}^n = \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\eta(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n, j\Delta_n} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})}, \qquad \eta(\rho)_i^n = \eta(\rho)_{i,i+2k_n}^n.
\end{array}$$

Lemma 4.3 *For all* $t, \rho > 0$ *we have* $\Delta_n \mathbb{E}\big(\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \eta(\rho)_i^n\big) \to 0$*, and for all* j, k *such that* $j + k \leq 2k_n$ *we have* $\mathbb{E}(\eta(\rho)_{i+j,k}^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) \leq \eta(\rho)_i^n$.

Proof. The second claim follows from the definitions of $\eta(\rho)_i^n$ and $\eta(\rho)_{i,j}^n$ and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. It is enough to prove the first claim when $\eta(\rho)_{t,s} = \sup_{u\in[0,s]} ||Y_{t+u} - Y_t||^2$ with $Y = b$ or $Y = \widetilde{b}(\rho)$ or $Y = \overline{c}(\rho)$ or $Y = c$ or $Y = \widetilde{c}'$. Recalling $\widetilde{\gamma}$ in (SA-r), we have $\|\Delta\widetilde{b}(\rho)_s\| \leq \|\Delta\widetilde{b}_s\| + K\,\Delta\widetilde{\gamma}_s/\rho$ (by Markov's inequality) and $\|\Delta\overline{c}(\rho)_s\| \leq \|\Delta(\widetilde{\sigma}^2)_s\| + \Delta\widetilde{\gamma}_s$. Hence by (SA-$r$), and in all cases, the successive jump times of Y, with jump size $\|\Delta Y_t\| > a$, are $T_1^a, T_2^a, \cdots, T_{N_a}^a$ for some finite integer N_a. We set $Y_t^a = Y_t - \sum_{s\leq t} \Delta Y_s\, 1_{\{\|\Delta Y_s\| > a\}}$, with (random) modulus of continuity $v(a,s) = \sup_{u\in[0,s],\, t\geq 0} \|Y_{t+u}^a - Y_t^a\|$. The variables $\eta(\rho)_{i\Delta_n, k_n\Delta_n}$ are smaller than some K, and also than $v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n)^2$ if the interval $I(n,i) = ((i-1)\Delta_n, (i+2k_n-1)\Delta_n]$ contains no T_j^a, hence

$$\eta(\rho)_i^n \ \leq\ \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})} + K \sum_{j=1}^{N_a} \mathbb{P}(T_{a,j} \in I(n,i) \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{array}{rl}
a_t^n := & \mathbb{E}\Big(\Delta_n \sum\limits_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \eta(\rho)_i^n\Big) \\
\leq & \mathbb{E}\Big(\Delta_n \sum\limits_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v(a, k_n\Delta_n)^2 \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})}\Big) + K\Delta_n \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N_a} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{P}(T_j^a \in I(n,i) \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})\Big) \\
\leq & t\,\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n)^2)} + K\Delta_n \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N_a} \sum\limits_{m=0}^{2k_n-1} \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum\limits_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} 1_{\{(i+m-1)\Delta_n < T_j^a \leq (i+m)\Delta_n\}}\Big) \\
\leq & \ t\,\sqrt{\mathbb{E}(v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n)^2)} + K k_n \Delta_n N_a.
\end{array}$$

Since $v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n)$ is bounded and $\limsup_n v(a, 2k_n\Delta_n) \leq a$, we deduce that $\limsup_n a^n_t \leq ta$ and, since this holds for all $a > 0$, the claim follows. $\square$

4) Let us introduce some additional notation. Firstly, we define the $\mathcal{G}^\rho$-measurable (random) set of integers:

$$L(n,\rho) = \{i = 1,2,\cdots : \mu([(i-1)\Delta_n,(i+2k_n)\Delta_n) \times E_\rho) = 0\} \tag{4.16}$$

(taking above, $2k_n$ instead of k_n, is necessary for the proof of Theorem 3.4). Observe that

$$i \in L(n,\rho),\ 0 \leq j \leq 2k_n \ \Rightarrow\ c^n_{i+j} - c^n_j = c(\rho)^n_{i+j} - c(\rho)^n_j. \tag{4.17}$$

Secondly, we define the following $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^d$-valued variables

$$\begin{array}{ll} \alpha^n_i = \Delta^n_i X' \, \Delta^n_i X'^* - c^n_i \, \Delta_n, & \overline{\alpha}^n_i = \frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n} \sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1} \alpha^n_{i+j} \\ \beta^n_i = \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1} c^n_{i+j}, & \overline{\beta}^n_i = \beta^n_i - c^n_i = \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1} (c^n_{i+j} - c^n_i) \\ \gamma^n_i = \widehat{c}'^n_{i+k_n} - \widehat{c}'^n_i = \overline{\alpha}^n_{i+k_n} + \overline{\beta}^n_{i+k_n} + c^n_{i+k_n} - \overline{\alpha}^n_i - \overline{\beta}^n_i - c^n_i. & \end{array} \tag{4.18}$$

Now we proceed with estimates. By Itô's formula and Burkholder-Gundy inequality and the first part of (4.14), for all $q \geq 0$ we get

$$\begin{array}{ll} \mathbb{E}(\|\alpha^n_i\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) \leq K_q \Delta^q_n, & \|\mathbb{E}(\alpha^n_i \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i)\| \leq K\Delta^{3/2}_n \\ \mathbb{E}(\|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) \leq K_q, & \mathbb{E}(\|\widehat{c}'^n_i\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) \leq K_q \end{array} \tag{4.19}$$

(the third estimate follows from the first one and Hölder's inequality, the last one from the third one and $\widehat{c}'^n_i = \overline{\alpha}^n_i + \beta^n_i$, plus $\|\beta^n_i\| \leq K$). The third inequality above can be improved: using the second inequality in (4.19), by successive conditioning and again Burkholder-Gundy inequality applied to the martingale increments $\alpha^n_{i+j} - \mathbb{E}(\alpha^n_{i+j} \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_{i+j})$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) \leq K_q \Delta^{q/4}_n. \tag{4.20}$$

Moreover, since the set $\{i \in L(n,\rho)$ is $\mathcal{G}^\rho$-measurable, the last part of (4.14), (4.17), and Hölder's inequality, readily yield

$$q \geq 2,\ i \in L(n,\rho) \ \Rightarrow\ \mathbb{E}\big(\|\overline{\beta}^n_i\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i)\big| \leq K_q\big(\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\phi_\rho + \Delta^{q/4}_n + \frac{\Delta^{q/2}_n}{\rho^q}\big). \tag{4.21}$$

5) The previous estimates are not enough for us. We will apply the estimates of Lemma 4.2 with $Y_t = X'_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} - X'_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ for any given pair n,i, and with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho)_{t\geq 0}$. We observe that on the set $A(\rho,n,i) = \{\exists j \leq 2k_n : i-j \in L(n,\rho)\}$, which is $\mathcal{G}^\rho$-measurable, and because of (4.17), the process c^Y coincide with $c(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} - c(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ if $t \in [0,\Delta_n]$. Then in restriction to this set, by (4.8) and (4.9) and by the definition of $\eta(\rho)^n_{i,1}$, we have

$$\big|\mathbb{E}(\Delta^n_i X'^j \, \Delta^n_i X'^m \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) - c^{n,jm}_i \Delta_n\big| \leq K_\rho \Delta^{3/2}_n (\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)^n_{i,1})$$
$$\big|\mathbb{E}\big(\Delta^n_i X'^j \, \Delta^n_i X'^k \, \Delta^n_i X'^l \, \Delta^n_i X'^m \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i\big) - (c^{n,jk}_i c^{n,lm}_i + c^{n,jl}_i c^{n,km}_i + c^{n,jm}_i c^{n,kl}_i)\Delta^2_n\big| \leq K_\rho \Delta^{5/2}_n$$

(the constant above depends on ρ, through the bound K/ρ for the drift of $c(\rho)$). Then a simple calculation gives us

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} \big\| \, \mathbb{E}(\alpha_i^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})\big\| \leq K_\rho \Delta_n^{3/2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_{i,1}^n) \\ \big|\mathbb{E}\big(\alpha_i^{n,jk}\alpha_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - (c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km} + c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl})\Delta_n^2\big| \leq K_\rho \Delta_n^{5/2} \end{array}\right\} \quad \text{on} \quad A(\rho,n,i) \tag{4.22}$$

Next, we apply Lemma 4.2 to the process $Y_t = c(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} - c(\rho)_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ for any given pair n,i, and with the filtration $(\mathcal{F}_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} \vee \mathcal{G}^\rho)_{t\geq 0}$. We then deduce from (4.7), plus again (4.17), that

$$\begin{array}{c} i \in L(n,\rho),\ 0 \leq t \leq k_n\Delta_n \Rightarrow \\ \big|\mathbb{E}((c_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t}^{jk} - c_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{jk})(c_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t}^{lm} - c_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{lm}) \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - t\overline{c}(\rho)_i^{n,jklm}\big| \leq K_\rho t\, \eta(\rho)_{i,k_n}^n \\ \big\|\mathbb{E}(c_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} - c_{(i-1)\Delta_n} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - t\widetilde{b}(\rho)_i^n \,\big\| \leq K_\rho t\, \eta(\rho)_{i,k_n}^n. \end{array} \tag{4.23}$$

Moreover, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (4.19) on the one hand, and (4.10) applied with the process $Y_t = X'_{(i-1)\Delta_n+t} - X'_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$ on the other hand, give us

$$i \in L(n,\rho) \ \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \big|\mathbb{E}\big(\alpha_i^{n,kl}\, \Delta_i^n \widetilde{b}(\rho)^{ms} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big)\big| \leq K\Delta_n \eta(\rho)_{i,1}^n \\ \big|\mathbb{E}\big(\alpha_i^{n,kl}\, \Delta_i^n c^{ms} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big)\big| \leq K_\rho \Delta_n^{3/2}(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_{i,1}^n). \end{array}\right. \tag{4.24}$$

6) We now proceed to estimates on $\overline{\alpha}_i^n$ and $\overline{\beta}_i^n$, in the next two lemmas:

Lemma 4.4 *We have*

$$i \in L(n,\rho) \ \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \big\| \, \mathbb{E}(\overline{\alpha}_i^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})\big\| \leq K_\rho \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n) \\ \big|\mathbb{E}(\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - \frac{1}{k_n}\,(c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km} + c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl})\big| \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \leq K_\rho \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n). \end{array}\right.$$

Proof. The first claim above directly follows from the first part of (4.22). For the second part, we set $\xi_i^n = c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km} + c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl}$ and write $\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm}$ as

$$\frac{1}{k_n^2\Delta_n^2}\Big(\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1} \alpha_{i+u}^{n,jk}\alpha_{i+u}^{n,lm} + \sum_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\sum_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1} \alpha_{i+u}^{n,jk}\alpha_{i+v}^{n,lm} + + \sum_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\sum_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1} \alpha_{i+u}^{n,lm}\alpha_{i+v}^{n,jk}\Big).$$

By (4.19) and (4.22) and successive conditioning and the second part of Lemma 4.3, the $\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$-conditional expectation of the two last terms above is smaller than $K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n)$, in restriction to the set $\{i \in L(n,\rho)\}$. The conditional expectation of the first term, up to $K_\rho\Delta_n$ and on the same set again, is $\frac{1}{k_n^2}\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1}\mathbb{E}(\xi_{i+u}^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})$. Using the boundedness of c_t and (4.14) and (4.17), we easily check that $\big|\mathbb{E}(\xi_{i+u}^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - \xi_i^n\big| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}$ on the same set when $u \leq k_n$, and the second claim follows. □

Lemma 4.5 *We have*

$$i \in L(n,\rho) \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \big\|\mathbb{E}(\overline{\beta}_i^n \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - \frac{k_n\Delta_n}{2}\,\widetilde{b}(\rho)_i^n\big\| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n) \\ \big|\mathbb{E}(\overline{\beta}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\beta}_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - \frac{k_n\Delta_n}{3}\,\overline{c}(\rho)_i^{n,jklm}\big| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n) \\ \big|\mathbb{E}(\overline{\beta}_i^{n,jk}(c_{i+k_n}^{n,lm} - c_i^{n,lm}) \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}) - \frac{k_n\Delta_n}{2}\,\overline{c}(\rho)_i^{n,jklm}\big| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n) \\ \big|\mathbb{E}(\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\beta}_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})\big| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)_i^n). \end{array}\right.$$

Proof. The first claim follows from the first part of (4.23). For the last three claims, and for simplicity, we consider the case $(j,k)=(l,m)$ and omit the indices below, but the same argument works in the general case. We have

$$\overline{\beta}_i^n\overline{\beta}_i^n = \frac{1}{k_n^2}\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1}(2k_n-2u-1)(c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n)^2+\frac{2}{k_n^2}\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-2}(c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n)\sum_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1}(c_{i+v}^n-c_{i+u}^n).$$

(4.23) and successive conditioning and the second part of Lemma 4.3 yield that the $\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$-conditional expectation of the above is, on the set $\{i\in L(n,\rho)\}$:

$$\begin{array}{l}\frac{\Delta_n\overline{c}(\rho)_i^n}{k_n^2}\sum\limits_{u=0}^{k_n-1}u(2k_n-2u-1)+\frac{2\Delta_n}{k_n^2}\sum\limits_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\mathbb{E}\big((c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n)\widetilde{b}(\rho)_{i+u}^n\mid\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big)\sum\limits_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1}j+R_n,\\ \quad\text{where}\ \ |R_n|\leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\Big(\eta(\rho)_i^n+\frac{1}{k_n^2}\sum\limits_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\sum\limits_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1}\mathbb{E}\big(\|c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n\|\eta(\rho)_{i+u,v-u}^n\mid\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big)\Big)\end{array}$$

Another application of the first part of (4.23), plus again the second part of Lemma 4.3 and $\|\widetilde{b}\|\leq K/\rho$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1}u(2k_n-2u-1)=k_n^3/3+\mathrm{O}(k_n^2)$ as $k_n\to\infty$, and $k_n\asymp 1/\sqrt{\Delta_n}$, imply that the above expression is

$$\frac{k_n\Delta_n}{3}\,\overline{c}(\rho)_i^n+R'_n,\qquad |R'_n|\leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n}+\eta(\rho)_i^n).$$

Coming back to the general situation in which (j,k) and (l,m) may be different, we deduce the second claim.

Next, we have

$$\overline{\beta}_i^n(c_{i+k_n}^n-c_i^n)=\frac{1}{k_n}\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1}(c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n)^2+\frac{1}{k_n}\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-1}(c_{i+u}^n-c_i^n)(c_{i+k_n}^n-c_{i+u}^n).$$

The third claim is then proved exactly as the previous one.

Finally, $\overline{\alpha}_i^n\overline{\beta}_i^n$ equals

$$\frac{1}{k_n^2\Delta_n}\Big(\sum_{u,v=0}^{k_n-1}\alpha_{i+u}^n(c_{i+u\wedge v}^n-c_i^n)+\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\alpha_{i+u}^n\sum_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1}(c_{i+v}^n-c_{i+u+1}^n)+\sum_{u=0}^{k_n-2}\alpha_{i+u}^n\sum_{v=u+1}^{k_n-1}\Delta_{i+u}^n c\Big).$$

By successive conditioning, the $\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$-conditional expectation of the first term in the right side above is smaller than $K_\rho\Delta_n^{3/4}$ by (4.19) and (4.23). Upon using additionally (4.24) we see that the conditional expectations of the second and third terms are smaller than $K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}(\sqrt{\Delta_n}+\eta(\rho)_i^n$. Therefore the last claim holds. $\square$

Finally, we get the following two estimates on the variables γ_i^n of (4.18), for any $q\geq 2$:

$$i\in L(n,\rho)\ \Rightarrow\left\{\begin{array}{l}\big|\mathbb{E}\big(\gamma_i^{n,jk}\,\gamma_i^{n,lm}\mid\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big)-\frac{2}{k_n}\,(c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km}+c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl})\\ \qquad\qquad -\frac{2k_n\Delta_n}{3}\,\overline{c}(\rho)_i^{n,jklm}\big|\leq K\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\big(\sqrt{\phi_\rho}+\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{\rho^2}\big)\\ \mathbb{E}(\|\gamma_i^n\|^q\mid\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho})\leq K_q\big(\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\phi_\rho+\Delta_n^{q/4}+\frac{\Delta_n^{q/2}}{\rho^q}\big).\end{array}\right.\tag{4.25}$$

To see that the first claim holds, one expands the product $\gamma_i^{n,jk}\gamma_i^{n,lm}$ and use successive conditioning, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (4.20), (4.23) and Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5; the contributing terms are

$$\begin{array}{l}\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm}+\overline{\alpha}_{i+k_n}^{n,jk}\,\overline{\alpha}_{i+k_n}^{n,lm}+\overline{\beta}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\beta}_i^{n,lm}+\overline{\beta}_{i+k_n}^{n,jk}\,\overline{\beta}_{i+k_n}^{n,lm}\\ \qquad +(c_{i+k_n}^{n,jk}-c_i^{n,jk})(c_{i+k_n}^{n,lm}-c_i^{n,lm})-\overline{\beta}_i^{n,jk}(c_{i+k_n}^{n,lm}-c_i^{n,lm})-\overline{\beta}_i^{n,lm}(c_{i+k_n}^{n,jk}-c_i^{n,jk}).\end{array}$$

For the second claim we use (4.20) and (4.21), and it holds for all $q\geq 2$:

4.4 The Behavior of Some Functionals of $c(\rho)$.

For $\rho>0$ we set

$$\begin{array}{l}U(\rho)_t^n=\sum_{j=3}^{[t/k_n\Delta_n]-3}\|\mu(\rho)_j^n\|^2\,1_{\{\|\mu(\rho)_j^n\|>u_n'/4\}},\quad\text{where}\\ \mu(\rho)_j^n=\frac{1}{k_n}\sum_{w=0}^{k_n-1}(c(\rho)_{jk_n+w}^n-c(\rho)_{(j-2)k_n+w}^n).\end{array}\tag{4.26}$$

The aim of this subsection is to prove the following lemma:

Lemma 4.6 *Under (SA-r) and (3.19) we have*

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\ \mathbb{E}\big(U(\rho)_t^n\big)\ =\ 0.$$

Assumption (SA-r) is of course not really necessary for this. What is needed is the assumptions concerning the process c_t only.

Proof. With the notation (4.13), and for $l=1,2$ we define $\mu^{(l)}(\rho)_j^n$ and $U^{(l)}(\rho)_t^n$ as above, upon substituting $c(\rho)$ and $u_n'/4$ with $c^{(l)}(\rho)$ and $u_n'/8$. Since $U(\rho)_t^n\leq 4U^{(1)}(\rho)_t^n+4U^{(2)}(\rho)_t^n$, it suffices to prove the result for each $U^{(l)}(\rho)_t^n$.

First, $\|\mu^{(1)}(\rho)_j^n\|^2\,1_{\{\|\mu^{(1)}(\rho)_i^n\|>u_n'/8\}}$ is smaller than $K\|\mu^{(1)}(\rho)_j^n\|^4/u_n'^2$, whereas (recalling $\|\widetilde{b}(\rho)\|\leq K/\rho$) classical estimates yield $\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mu^{(1)}(\rho)_j^n\|^4\big)\leq K\Delta_n(1+\Delta_n/\rho)$. Thus the expectation of $U^{(1)}(\rho)_t^n$ is less than $K\Delta_n^{1/2-2\varpi'}(1+\Delta_n/\rho)$, yielding the result for $U^{(1)}(\rho)_t^n$.

Secondly, we have $U^{(2)}(\rho)_t^n\leq\sum_{j=3}^{[t/k_n\Delta_n]}\|\mu^{(2)}(\rho)_i^n\|^2$ and the first part of (4.14) yields $\mathbb{E}\big(\|\mu^{(2)}(\rho)_i^n\|^2\big)\leq K\phi_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}$. Since $\phi_\rho\to 0$ as $\rho\to 0$, the result for $U^{(1)}(\rho)_t^n$ follows. □

4.5 A Basic Decomposition.

We start the proof of Theorem 3.1 by giving a decomposition of $V'(g)^n-V(g)$. For this, we use the following ingredients:

1 - the easily checked equality (when $t>k_n\Delta_n$)

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\int_0^t g(c_s)\,ds&=&\frac{1}{k_n}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}g(c_s)\,ds+\int_{\Delta_n[t/\Delta_n]}^t g(c_s)\,ds\\ &&+\frac{1}{k_n}\int_0^{k_n\Delta_n}\Big(g(c_s)\big(k_n-1-\big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\big)+g(c_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+s})\big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\Big)\,ds;\end{array}$$

2 - the key property $\widehat{c}'^n_i = \overline{\alpha}^n_i + \beta^n_i$;
3 - a Taylor expansion of $g(\overline{\alpha}^n_i + \beta^n_i)$ around β^n_i, and a Taylor expansion of $g(\beta^n_i)$ and of $g(c_s)$ for $s \in ((i-1)\Delta_n, (i+k_n-1)\Delta_n]$ around c^n_i.
Then, a simple calculation shows that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,(V'(g)^n_t - V(g)_t) = \sum_{j=1}^6 V^{n,j}_t$, as soon as $t > k_n\Delta_n$, and where (the sums on components below always extend from 1 to d):

$$\begin{aligned}
V^{n,1}_t &= \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\big(g(\widehat{c}^n_i) - g(\widehat{c}'^n_i)\big)\\
V^{n,2}_t &= \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\sum_{l,m}\partial_{lm}g(\beta^n_i)\,\overline{\alpha}^{n,lm}_i\\
V^{n,3}_t &= \sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\Big(g(\beta^n_i + \overline{\alpha}^n_i) - g(\beta^n_i) - \sum_{l,m}\partial_{lm}g(\beta^n_i)\,\overline{\alpha}^{n,lm}_i\Big)\\
V^{n,4}_t &= \tfrac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\sum_{l,m}\partial_{lm}g(c^n_i)\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}(\beta^{n,lm}_i - c^{lm}_s)\,ds\\
V^{n,5}_t &= \tfrac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}\Big(g(\beta^n_i) - g(c_s) - \sum_{l,m}\partial_{lm}g(c^n_i)(\beta^{n,lm}_i - c^{lm}_s)\Big)\,ds\\
V^{n,6}_t &= \tfrac{(k_n-1)\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{2}\,\big(g(\widehat{c}^n_1) + g(\widehat{c}^n_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1})\big) - \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,\textstyle\int_{\Delta_n[t/\Delta_n]}^t g(c_s)\,ds\\
&\qquad -\tfrac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\,\textstyle\int_0^{k_n\Delta_n}\Big(g(c_s)\big(k_n - 1 - \big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\big) + g(c_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+s})\big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\Big)\,ds.
\end{aligned}$$

The leading term are $V^{n,2}$, $V^{n,3}$ and $V^{n,5}$, and we start by proving that the other terms are negligible, in the sense that they satisfy

$$V^{n,j}_t \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ 0 \tag{4.27}$$

for all t. The rest of this subsection is devoted to proving (4.27) for $j = 1, 4, 6$ successively.

The case $j = 1$: (3.6) implies

$$|g(\widehat{c}^n_i) - g(\widehat{c}'^n_i)| \le K(1+\|\widehat{c}^n_i\|+\|\widehat{c}'^n_i\|)^{p-1}\,\|\widehat{c}^n_i - \widehat{c}'^n_i\| \le K(1+\|\widehat{c}'^n_i\|)^{p-1}\,\|\widehat{c}^n_i - \widehat{c}'^n_i\| + K\|\widehat{c}^n_i - \widehat{c}'^n_i\|^p.$$

Recalling the last part of (4.19), we deduce from (4.12), from the fact that $1 - r\varpi - p(1-2\varpi) < \frac{1-r\varpi}{q} - (1-2\varpi)$ for all $q > 1$ small enough, and from Hölder's inequality, that $\mathbb{E}(|g(\widehat{c}^n_i) - g(\widehat{c}'^n_i)|) \le K a_n \Delta_n^{(2p-r)\varpi+1-p}$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sup_{s\le t}|V^{n,1}_s|\Big) \le K t a_n \Delta_n^{(2p-r)\varpi+1/2-p}$$

and (4.27) for $j = 1$ follows.

The case $j = 4$: We denote ρ^n_i the ith summand in the definition of $V^{n,4}_t$. By splitting the integral showing in this summand into pieces over the intervals $((i-1+j)\Delta_n, (i+j)\Delta_n]$, we see that

$$\rho^n_i = -\sum_{l,m}\partial_{lm}g(c^n_i)\sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1}\rho'^{n,lm}_{i+j}, \quad \text{where}\ \ \rho'^n_i = \int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i\Delta_n}(c_s - c_{(i-1)\Delta_n})\,ds.$$

(4.4) yields

$$\|\mathbb{E}(\rho'^n_i \mid \mathcal{F}^n_i)\| \le K\Delta_n^2, \qquad \mathbb{E}(\|\rho'^n_i\|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^n_i) \le K\Delta_n^3,$$

implying in turn, because $|g(c^n_i)| \le K$ and $k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n} \to \theta$:

$$|\mathbb{E}(\rho^n_i \mid \mathcal{F}^n_i)| \le K\Delta_n^{3/2}, \qquad \mathbb{E}(|\rho^n_i|^2 \mid \mathcal{F}^n_i) \le K\Delta_n^2.$$

Since ρ_i^n is $\mathcal{F}_{i+k_n}^n$-measurable, we thus get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}((V_t^{n,4})^2) = \textstyle\sum_{i,j=1}^{[t/\Delta_n k_n+1} \mathbb{E}(\rho_i^n\, \rho_j^n) \\
&\quad \leq 2k_n \textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}((\rho_i^n)^2) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \sum_{j=i+k_n}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \mathbb{E}\big(|\rho_i^n|\; |\mathbb{E}(\rho_j^n \mid \mathcal{F}_{i+k_n}^n|\big) \leq K(\Delta_n^{1/2} t + \Delta_n^{1/4} t^2),
\end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.27) for $j = 4$.

The case $j = 6$: In the definition of $V_t^{n,6}$ the second term is smaller than $K\sqrt{\Delta_n}$ and thus goes to 0. As mentioned after (3.2), we have $\widehat{c}_1^n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} c_0$ and $\widehat{c}_{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}^n \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} c_t$, whereas $k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n} \to \theta$, thus the first term converges to $\frac{\theta}{2}\,(g(c_0) + g(c_{t-}))$, and so does the last term, because both $\int_0^{k_n\Delta_n} \big(k_n - 1 - \big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\big)\, ds$ and $\int_0^{k_n\Delta_n} \big[\frac{s}{\Delta_n}\big]\, ds$ are equivalent to $k_n^2\Delta_n/2$. Then we conclude (4.27) for $j = 6$.

4.6 The First Leading Term.

Our aim here is to prove that

$$V^{n,2} \overset{\mathcal{L}-s}{\Longrightarrow} Z \tag{4.28}$$

(functional stable convergence in law), where Z is the process defined in Theorem 3.1.

Since $\overline{\alpha}_i^n = \frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n} \sum_{j=0}^{k_n-1} \alpha_{i+j}^n$, a change of indices allows us to rewrite $V^{n,2}$ as

$$V_t^{n,2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} \sum_{l,m} w_i^{n,lm}\, \alpha_i^{n,lm}, \quad \text{where} \;\; w_i^{n,lm} = \frac{1}{k_n} \sum_{j=(i-[t/\Delta_n]+k_n-1)^+}^{(i-1)\wedge(k_n-1)} \partial_{lm} g(\beta_{i-j}^n).$$

Observe that w_i^n and α_i^n are measurable with respect to $\mathcal{F}_i^n$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i+1}^n$, respectively, so by Theorem IX.7.28 of [5] (with $G = 0$ and $Z = 0$ in the notation of that theorem) it suffices to prove the following four convergences in probability, for all $t > 0$ and all component indices:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} w_i^{n,lm}\, \mathbb{E}(\alpha_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; 0 \tag{4.29}$$

$$\frac{1}{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} w_i^{n,jk}\, w_i^{n,lm}\, \mathbb{E}(\alpha_i^{n,jk}\, \alpha_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^t \partial_{jk} g(c_s)\, \partial_{lm} g(c_s)\, \big(c_s^{jl} c_s^{km} + c_s^{jm} c_s^{kl}\big)\, ds \tag{4.30}$$

$$\frac{1}{\Delta_n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} \|w_i^n\|^4\, \mathbb{E}(\|\alpha_i^n\|^4 \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; 0 \tag{4.31}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} w_i^{n,lm}\, \mathbb{E}(\alpha_i^{n,lm}\, \Delta_i^n N \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; 0, \tag{4.32}$$

where $N = W^k$ for some k, or is an arbitrary bounded martingale, orthogonal to W.

For proving these properties, we pick a ρ bigger than the upper bound of the function J, so $\mathcal{G}^\rho$ becomes the trivial σ-field and $\mathcal{F}_i^n = \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$. In such a way, the set $L(n,\rho)$ is the set of all positive integers, and we can apply all estimates of the previous subsections with the conditioning σ-fields $\mathcal{F}_i^n$. Therefore (4.19) and the property $\|w_i^n\| \le K$ readily imply (4.29) and (4.31). In view of the form of α_i^n, a usual argument (see e.g. [6]) shows that in fact $\mathbb{E}(\alpha_i^{n,lm}\,\Delta_i^n N \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) = 0$ for all N as above, hence (4.32) holds.

For (4.30), by (4.22) it suffices to prove that

$$\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} w_i^{n,jk}\, w_i^{n,lm}\,(c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km}+c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl}) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \int_0^t \partial_{jk}g(c_s)\,\partial_{lm}g(c_s)\,\big(c_s^{jl}c_s^{km}+c_s^{jm}c_s^{kl}\big)\,ds.$$

In view of the definition of w_i^n, for each t we have $w_{i(n,t)}^{n,jk} \to \partial_{jk}g(c_t)$ and $c_{i(n,t)}^{n,jk} \to c_t^{jk}$ almost surely if $|i(n,t)\Delta_n - t| \le k_n\Delta_n$, and the above convergence follows by the dominated convergence theorem, thus ending the proof of (4.28).

4.7 The Second Leading Term.

In this subsection we prove that $V_t^{n,3} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} A_t^{(c,1)}$ for all t. Set $v_i^n = g(\beta_i^n + \overline{\alpha}_i^n) - g(\beta_i^n) - \sum_{lm}\partial_{lm}g(\beta_i^n)\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm}$. A Taylor expansion gives us

$$v_i^n = v(1)_i^n + v(2)_i^n + v(3)_i^n, \quad \text{where} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} v(1)_i^n = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l,m}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(\beta_i^n)\,\mathbb{E}(\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^n) \\ v(2)_i^n = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l,m}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(\beta_i^n)\,\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,jk}\,\overline{\alpha}_i^{n,lm} - v(1)_i^n \\ |v(3)_i^n| \le K(1+\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\|)^{p-3}\,\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\|^3. \end{array} \right.$$

Therefore

$$V^{n,3} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} U(j)^n, \quad \text{where} \quad U(j)_t^n = \sqrt{\Delta_n}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} v(j)_i^n. \tag{4.33}$$

We deduce from Lemma 4.3 and 4.4 (again with $\rho > \sup|J|$, so $L(n,\rho) = \mathbb{N}^*$) and from $\|\partial^2 g(\overline{\mathbb{E}}_i^n)\| \le K$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big|U(1)_t^n - \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{2k_n}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1}\ \sum_{j,k,l,m}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(\beta_i^n)\,\big(c_i^{n,jl}c_i^{n,km}+c_i^{n,jm}c_i^{n,kl}\big)\Big|\Big) \ \to\ 0.$$

Using $k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n} \to \theta$, it then follows from Riemann approximation (as for (4.30) above, recall that for all t we have $\beta_{[t/\Delta_n]}^n \to c_t$ a.s.) that

$$U(1)_t^n \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ A_t^{(c,1)}. \tag{4.34}$$

Next, $v(2)_i^n$ is $\mathcal{F}_{i+k_n}^n$-measurable and with vanishing $\mathcal{F}_i^n$-conditional expectation, hence (as in the case $j=4$ above)

$$\mathbb{E}\big((U(2)_t^n)^2\big) \le 2k_n\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} E\big(|v(2)_i^n|^2\big) \le 2k_n\Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} E\big(\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\|^4\big) \le Ktk_n\Delta_n,$$

where we have applied (4.20) for the last inequality. Hence $U(2)^n_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. Finally (4.20) yields

$$\mathbb{E}\big(|U(3)^n_t|\big) \leq K\sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1} \mathbb{E}\big((1+\|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|)^{p-3}\,\|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|^3\big) \leq Kt\Delta_n^{1/4}.$$

Then $U(3)^n_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$, and in view of (4.33) and (4.34) we have $V^{n,4}_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} A^{(c,1)}_t$.

4.8 The Third Leading Term.

Finally we prove that

$$V^{n,5}_t \;\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\; A^{(c),2}_t + A^{(d)}_t. \tag{4.35}$$

Below, v^n_i denotes the ith summand in the definition of $V^{n,5}_t$. We take $\rho \in (0,1]$, and will eventually let it go to 0. With the sets $L(n,\rho)$ of (4.16), we associate

$$\begin{array}{l} L(n,\rho,t) = \{1,\cdots,[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1\} \cap L(n,\rho) \\ \overline{L}(n,\rho,t) = \{1,\cdots,[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1\} \backslash L(n,\rho). \end{array}$$

We split the sum giving $V^{n,5}_t$ into two terms:

$$U^{n,\rho}_t = \frac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)} v^n_i, \qquad \overline{U}^{n,\rho}_t = \frac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i\in \overline{L}(n,\rho,t)} v^n_i.$$

The processes $U^{n,\rho}$. We do a Taylor expansion of both $g(c_s)$ and $g(\beta^n_i)$ around c^n_i. Recalling $\overline{\beta}^n_i = \beta^n_i - c^n_i$, we obtain (without mentioning the component indices for simplicity, and recalling that c_s and $\overline{\beta}^n_i$ are uniformly bounded)::

$$\begin{array}{l} \big|g(\beta^n_i) - g(c^n_i) - \partial g(c^n_i)\overline{\beta}^n_i - \frac{1}{2}\,\partial^2 g(c^n_i)\overline{\beta}^n_i \otimes \overline{\beta}^n_i\big| \leq K\|\overline{\beta}^n_i\|^3 \\ \big|g(c_s) - g(c^n_i) - \partial g(c^n_i)(c_s - c^n_i) - \frac{1}{2}\,\partial^2 g(c^n_i)(c_s - c^n_i) \otimes (c_s - c^n_i)\big| \leq K\|c_s - c^n_i\|^3). \end{array}$$

It follows that $v^n_i = v(1)^n_i + v(2)^n_i + v(3)^n_i$, where

$$\begin{array}{l} \zeta^{n,jklm}_{i,s} = \overline{\beta}^{n,jk}_i\,\overline{\beta}^{n,lm}_i - (c^{jk}_s - c^{jk}_{(i-1)\Delta_n})(c^{lm}_s - c^{lm}_{(i-1)\Delta_n}) \\ v(1)^n_i = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l,m} \partial^2_{jk,lm} g(c^n_i)\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n} \zeta^{n,jklm}_{i,s}\,ds \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i\Big) \\ v(2)^n_i = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k,l,m} \partial^2_{jk,lm} g(c^n_i)\,\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n} \zeta^{n,jklm}_{i,s}\,ds - v(1)^n_i \\ |v(3)^n_i| \leq K\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n} \big(\|\overline{\beta}^n_i\|)^3 + \|c_s - c_{(i-1)\Delta_n}\|^3\big)\,ds. \end{array}$$

Therefore

$$U^{n,\rho} = \sum_{j=1}^{3} U(j)^{n,\rho}, \quad \text{where} \quad U(j)^{n,\rho}_t = \frac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)} v(j)^n_i. \tag{4.36}$$

Combining (4.23) and Lemma 4.5, we see that for $s \in [(i-1)\Delta_n, (i+k_n-1)\Delta_n]$ we have

$$\Big|\mathbb{E}(\zeta^{n,jklm}_{i,s} \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_i) - \big(\frac{k_n\Delta_n}{3} - s + (i-1)\Delta_n\big)\overline{c}(\rho)^{n,jklm}_i\Big| \leq K_\rho\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,(\sqrt{\Delta_n} + \eta(\rho)^n_i).$$

Since $\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}\big(\frac{k_n\Delta_n}{3}-s+(i-1)\Delta_n\big)\,ds=-\frac{k_n^2\Delta_n^2}{6}$, and since $L(n,\rho)$ is $\mathcal{G}^\rho$-measurable, we deduce from Lemma 4.3 and $\|\partial^2 g(c_i^n)\|\leq K$ that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big|U(1)_t^{n,\rho}+\frac{k_n\Delta_n^{3/2}}{12}\sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)}\ \sum_{j,k,l,m}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(c_i^n)\overline{c}(\rho)_i^{n,jklm}\Big|\Big)\ \to\ 0.$$

We observe that the number of indices lesser than $[t/\Delta_n]-k_n+1$ and not in $L(n,\rho,t)$ is at most $k_nN_t^\rho$, where $N_t^\rho=\mu((0,t]\times E_\rho)$ is finite; hence, since further $k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}\to\theta$, the sum inside the expectation above is a Riemann sum, and we deduce that

$$U(1)_t^{n,\rho}\ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ U_t^\rho:=-\frac{\theta}{12}\sum_{j,k,l,m}\int_0^t\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(c_s)\,\overline{c}(\rho)_s^{jklm}\,ds. \tag{4.37}$$

Next, $v(2)_i^n$ is $\mathcal{F}_{i+k_n}$-measurable and with vanishing $\mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}$-conditional expectation, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\big((U(2)_t^{n,\rho})^2\mid\mathcal{G}^\rho\big)\ &\leq\ \tfrac{2}{k_n\Delta_n}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)}|v(2)_i^n|^2\mid\mathcal{G}^\rho\Big)\\ &\leq\ K\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\textstyle\sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)}\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}\|\zeta_{i,s}^n\|^2\,ds\mid\mathcal{G}^\rho\Big)\\ &\leq\ Kt\Big(\phi_\rho+\sqrt{\Delta_n}+\tfrac{\Delta_n^{3/2}}{\rho^4}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied (4.14), (4.17) and (4.21) for the last inequality. In the same way, we get

$$\mathbb{E}\big(|U(3)_t^{n,\rho}|\big)\leq Kt\Big(\phi_\rho+\Delta_n^{1/4}+\frac{\Delta_n}{\rho^3}\Big).$$

Since $\phi_\rho\to 0$ as $\rho\to 0$, we readily deduce from the last two inequalities that

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\ \mathbb{E}(|U(2)_t^{n,\rho}|+|U(3)_t^{n,\rho}|)\ =\ 0. \tag{4.38}$$

The processes $\overline{U}^{n,\rho}$. We will use here the jump times $S_1^\rho,S_2^\rho,\cdots$ of the Poisson process $\mu((0,t]\times E_\rho)$, and will restrict our attention to the set $\Omega_{n,t,\rho}$ defined before (4.13), whose probability goes to 1 as $n\to\infty$. On this set, $\overline{L}(n,\rho,t)$ is the collection of all integers i which are between $[S_q^\rho/\Delta_n]-2k_n+2$ and $[S_q^\rho/\Delta_n]+1$, for some q between 1 and N_t^ρ. Thus

$$\overline{U}_t^{n,\rho}=\sum_{q=1}^{N_t^\rho}H(n,\rho,q),\qquad\text{where}\ \ H(n,\rho,q)=\frac{1}{k_n\sqrt{\Delta_n}}\sum_{i=[S_q^\rho/\Delta_n]-2k_n+2}^{[S_q^\rho/\Delta_n]+1}v_i^n.$$

The behavior of each $H(n,\rho,q)$ is a pathwise question. We fix q and set $S=S_q^\rho$ and $a_n=[S/\Delta_n]$. Since S has a density, we can assume without loss of generality that $S>a_n\Delta_n$ for all n. We have $v_i^n=v_i'^n-v_i''^n$, where

$$\begin{aligned}v_i'^n&=k_n\Delta_n\Big(g(\beta_i^n)-\textstyle\sum_{jk}\partial_{jk}g(c_i^n)\beta_i^{n,jk}\Big)\\ v_i''^n&=\textstyle\int_{(i-1)\Delta_n}^{(i+k_n-1)\Delta_n}\Big(g(c_s)-\sum_{jk}\partial_{jk}g(c_i^n)c_s^{jk}\Big)\,ds.\end{aligned}$$

We will use the càdlàg property of c. If $a_n - 2k_n + 2 \le i \le a_n - k_n$ we have $c_i^n \to c_{S-}$ and $\beta_i^n \to c_{S-}$, and also $c_s \to c_{S-}$ uniformly in s in the interval $[(i-1)\Delta_n, (i+k_n-1)\Delta_n]$, so $\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\, v_i^n \to 0$ is obvious.

Next we let $a_n - k_n + 1 \le i \le a_n + 1$. We have $c_i^n \to c_{S-}$, and $\beta_i^n - c_{S-} - \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S \to 0$ is a simple consequence of the definition of β_i^n, hence

$$\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\, v_i'^n - g\Big(c_{S-} + \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S\Big) - \sum_{jk} \partial_{jk} g(c_{S-})\,\Big(c_{S-}^{jk} + \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S^{jk}\Big) \to 0.$$

Analogously, splitting the integration interval in the definition of $v_i''^n$ into $[(i-1)\Delta_n, S)$ and $[S, (i+k_n-1)\Delta_n]$, we see that

$$\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\, v_i''^n - \frac{a_n - i}{k_n}\, g(c_{S-}) - \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\, g(c_S) - \sum_{jk} \partial_{jk} g(c_{S-})\,\Big(c_{S-} + \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S\Big) \to 0,$$

and it follows that

$$\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\, v_i^n - g\Big(c_{S-} + \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S\Big) + \frac{a_n - i}{k_n}\, g(c_{S-}) + \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\, g(c_S) \to 0.$$

Putting together the behavior of $\frac{1}{k_n\Delta_n}\, v_i^n$ for the sets of possibilities for i, as specified above, we easily deduce

$$H(n,\rho,q) - \sqrt{\Delta_n}\sum_{l=0}^{k_n-1}\Big(g\big(c_{S_q-} + \frac{l}{k_n}\,\Delta c_{S_q}\big) - \big(1 - \frac{l}{k_n}\big)g(c_{S_q-}) - \frac{l}{k_n}\, g(c_{S_q-} + \Delta c_{S_q})\Big) \to 0$$

and by Riemann integration this yields

$$H(n,\rho,q) \to \theta \int_0^1 \big(g(c_{S_q-} + w\Delta c_{S_q}) - (1-w) g(c_{S_q-}) - w g'(c_{S_q-} + \Delta c_{S_q})\big)\, dw,$$

which is indeed $\theta\, G(c_{S_q-}, \Delta c_{S_q})$. Henceforth, we have

$$\overline{U}_t^{n,\rho} \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ \overline{U}_t^{\rho} := \theta \sum_{q=1}^{N_t^\rho} G(c_{S_q^\rho -}, \Delta c_{S_q^\rho}). \tag{4.39}$$

Proof of (4.35). On the one hand, $V^{n,5} = U(1)^{n,\rho} + U(2)^{n,\rho} + U(3)^{n,\rho} + \overline{U}^{n,\rho}$; on the other hand, the dominated convergence theorem (observe that $\overline{c}(\rho)_t \to \widetilde{\sigma}_t^2$ for all t) yields that $U_t^\rho \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} A_t^{(c),2}$ and $\overline{U}_t^\rho \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} A_t^{(d)}$ as $\rho \to 0$. Then the property (4.35) follows from (4.37), (4.38) and (4.39). This completes the proof of Theorem 3.1.

4.9 Proof of Theorem 3.4.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 follows the same line as in Subsection 4.8, and we begin with an auxiliary step.

Step 1) Replacing $\widehat{c}_i^n$ by $\widehat{c}_i'^n$. The summands in the definition (3.14) of $A_t^{n,c,2}$ are $R(\widehat{c}_i^n, \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}^n)$, where $R(x,y)=\sum_{j,k,l,m}\partial^2_{jk,lm}g(x)(y^{jk}-x^{jk})(y^{lm}-x^{lm})$, and we set

$$A_t'^{n,c,2} = -\frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{8}\sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]-2k_n+1} R(\widehat{c}_i'^n, \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}'^n).$$

We prove here that

$$A_t^{n,c,2} - A_t'^{n,c,2} \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ 0 \tag{4.40}$$

for all t, and this is done as in to the step $j=1$ in Subsection 4.5. The function R is C^1 on $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ with $\|\partial^j R(x,y)\| \leq K(1+\|x\|+\|y\|)^{p-j}$ for $j=0,1$, by (3.6). Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |R(\widehat{c}_i^n, \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}^n) - R(\widehat{c}_i'^n, \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}^n)| \ \leq\ & K(1+\|\widehat{c}_i'^n\| + \|\widehat{c}_{i+k_n}'^n)\|)^{p-1}(\|\widehat{c}_i^n - \widehat{c}_i'^n\| + \|\widehat{c}_{i+k_n}^n - \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}'^n\|) \\ & +K\|\widehat{c}_i^n - \widehat{c}_i'^n\|^p + K\|\widehat{c}_{i+k_n}^n - \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}'^n\|^p. \end{aligned}$$

Then, exactly as in the case afore-mentioned, we conclude (4.40), and it remains to prove that, for all t, we have

$$A_t'^{n,c,2} \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ A_t^{(c),2} + A_t'^{(c),1} + A_t'^{(d)}.$$

Step 2) From now on we use the same notation as in Subsection 4.8, although they denote different variables or processes. For any $\rho \in (0,1]$ we have $A_t'^{n,c,2} = -U_t^{n,\rho} - \overline{U}_t^{n,\rho}$, where

$$U_t^{n,\rho} = \sqrt{\Delta_n}\sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)} v_i^n, \qquad \overline{U}_t^{n,\rho} = \sqrt{\Delta_n}\sum_{i\in \overline{L}(n,\rho,t)} v_i^n, \qquad v_i^n = \frac{1}{8}\,R(\widehat{c}_i'^n, \widehat{c}_{i+k_n}'^n).$$

The decomposition (4.36) takes the form

$$\begin{array}{l} U^{n,\rho} = \sum_{j=1}^3 U(j)^{n,\rho}, \quad \text{where} \quad U(j)_t^{n,\rho} = \sqrt{\Delta_n}\ \sum_{i\in L(n,\rho,t)} v(j)_i^n \quad \text{and} \\ v(1)_i^n = \frac{1}{8}\sum_{j,l,k,m}\partial^2_{jl,km}\,g(c_i^n)\ \mathbb{E}\big(\gamma_i^{n,jk}\,\gamma_i^{n,lm} \mid \mathcal{F}_i^{n,\rho}\big) \\ v(2)_i^n = \frac{1}{8}\sum_{j,l,k,m}\partial^2_{jl,km}\,g(c_i^n)\,\gamma_i^{n,jk}\,\gamma_i^{n,lm} - v(1)_i^n \\ v(3)_i^n = v_i^n - v(1)_i^n - v(2)_i^n. \end{array}$$

Use $\widehat{c}_i'^n - c_i^n = \overline{\alpha}_i^n + \overline{\beta}_i^n$ and (3.6) and a Taylor expansion to check that

$$|v(3)_i^n| \leq K\|\gamma_i^n\|^2\,(\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\| + \|\overline{\beta}_i^n\|)\,(1+\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\| + \|\overline{\beta}_i^n\|)^{p-3}.$$

We also have $|v(2)_i^n| \leq K\|\gamma_i^n\|^2\,(1+\|\overline{\alpha}_i^n\| + \|\overline{\beta}_i^n\|)^{p-3}$, hence (4.20), (4.21) and (4.25), plus Hölder's inequality, yield

$$\mathbb{E}(|v(3)_i^n| \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho) + \mathbb{E}(|v(2)_i^n|^2 \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho) \leq K\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\Big(\phi_\rho + \Delta_n^{1/4} + \frac{\Delta_n}{\rho^p}\Big),$$

and thus (4.38) holds here as well. Moreover, (4.25) again yields (4.37), with now

$$U_t^\rho = \sum_{j,k,l,m}\int_0^t \partial^2_{jk,lm}\,g(c_s)\,\Big(\frac{\theta}{12}\,\overline{c}(\rho)_s^{jklm} + \frac{1}{4\theta}\,(c_s^{jl}c_s^{km} + c_s^{jm}c_s^{kl})\Big)\,ds.$$

This goes to $-A^{(c),2}_t + \frac{1}{2}\,A'^{(c),1}_t$ as $\rho \to 0$. Therefore, we are left to prove that

$$\rho > 0 \;\Rightarrow\; \overline{U}^{n,\rho}_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \overline{U}^{\rho}_t, \quad \text{with, as } \rho \to 0,\; \overline{U}^{\rho}_t \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} -A'^{(d)}_t. \tag{4.41}$$

Step 3) Now we turn to $\overline{U}^{n,\rho}$, which on the set $\Omega_{n,t,\rho}$ is, as before,

$$\overline{U}^{n,\rho}_t = \sum_{q=1}^{N^\rho_t} H(n,\rho,q), \quad \text{where } H(n,\rho,q) = \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]-2k_n+2}^{[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]+1} v^n_i,$$

and we set

$$\overline{v}^n_i = \frac{1}{8} \sum_{j,k,l,m} \partial^2_{jk,lm}\, g(\beta^n_i)\,(\beta^{n,jk}_{i+k_n} - \beta^{n,jk}_i)(\beta^{n,lm}_{i+k_n} - \beta^{n,lm}_i), \;\; \overline{H}(n,\rho,q) = \sqrt{\Delta_n} \sum_{i=[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]-2k_n+2}^{[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]+1} \overline{v}^n_i.$$

We use $\widehat{c}'^n_j = \beta^n_j + \overline{\alpha}^n_j$ and $\|\beta^n_j\| \leq K$ and (3.6) to obtain

$$|v^n_i - \overline{v}^n_i| \leq K(1 + \|\overline{\alpha}^n_{i+k_n}\| + \|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|)^{p-2}\,(\|\overline{\alpha}^n_{i+k_n}\| + \|\overline{\alpha}^n_i\|),$$

yielding $\mathbb{E}(|v^n_i - \overline{v}^n_i| \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho) \leq K\Delta_n^{1/4}$ by (4.20) and Hölder's inequality. Therefore, as $n \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\Big(\Big\{\Big|\overline{U}^{n,\rho}_t - \sum_{q=1}^{N^\rho_t} \overline{H}(n,\rho,q)\Big| > \varepsilon\Big\} \cap \Omega_{n,t,\rho}\Big) \;&\leq\; \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{\varepsilon}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q=1}^{N^\rho_t} \sum_{i=[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]-2k_n}^{[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]+1} |v^n_i - \overline{v}^n_i|\Big) \\
&\leq\; \frac{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}{\varepsilon}\,\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{q=1}^{N^\rho_t} \sum_{i=[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]-2k_n}^{[S^\rho_q/\Delta_n]+1} |v^n_i - \overline{v}^n_i| \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho\Big) \\
&\leq\; \frac{K k_n \Delta_n^{3/4}}{\varepsilon}\,\mathbb{E}(N^\rho_t) \;\to\; 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

We are thus left with studying the behavior of the variables $\overline{H}(n,\rho,q)$, and we do as in the previous subsection. Again, $a_n = [S/\Delta_n]$. If $a_n - 2k_n + 2 \leq i \leq a_n - k_n$ (case 1), we have $\beta^n_i \to c_{S-}$ and $\beta^n_{i+k_n} - c_{S-} - \frac{2k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S \to 0$, whereas if $a_n - k_n + 1 \leq i \leq a_n + 1$ (case 2) we have $\beta^n_{i+k_n} \to c_S$ and $\beta^n_i - c_{S-} - \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_{S-} \to 0$. Hence $\overline{v}^n_i - \overline{v}'^n_i \to 0$, where

$$\overline{v}'^n_i = \begin{cases} \frac{(2k_n - a_n + i)^2}{8k_n^2} \sum_{j,k,l,m} \partial^2_{jk,lm}\, g(c_{S-})\,\Delta c^{jk}_S\,\Delta c^{lm}_S & \text{in case 1} \\ \frac{(a_n - i)^2}{8k_n^2} \sum_{j,k,l,m} \partial^2_{jk,lm}\, g\Big(c_{S-} - \frac{k_n - a_n + i}{k_n}\,\Delta c_S\Big)\,\Delta c^{jk}_S\,\Delta c^{lm}_S & \text{in case 2.} \end{cases}$$

We then deduce, by Riemann integration, that

$$\overline{H}(n,\rho,q) \to \frac{\theta}{8} \sum_{j,k,l,m} \int_0^1 \big(\partial^2_{jk,lm}\, g(c_{S_q-}) + \partial^2_{jk,lm}\, g(c_{S_q-} + (1-w)\Delta c_{S_q})\big)\, w^2\, \Delta c^{jk}_{S_q}\,\Delta c^{lm}_{S_q}\, dw,$$

which is $\theta G'(c_{S_q-}, \Delta c_{S_q})$. Combining this with (4.42), we obtain the first part of (4.41), with $\overline{U}^\rho_t = \theta \sum_{q=1}^{N^\rho_t} G'(c_{S^\rho_q-}, \Delta c_{S^\rho_q})$, which in turn satisfies the second part of (4.41) by the dominated convergence theorem. The proof of Theorem 3.4 is thus complete.

4.10 Proof of Theorem 3.5.

The proof is once more somewhat similar to the proof of Subsection 4.8, although the way we replace $\widehat{c}_i^n$ by $\widehat{c}_i'^n$ and further by $\overline{\alpha}_i^n + \beta_i^n$ is different.

1) Preliminaries. The jth summand in (3.21) involves several estimators $\widehat{c}_i^n$, spanning the time interval $((j-3)k_n\Delta_n, (j+2)k_n\Delta_n]$. It is thus convenient to replace the sets $L(n,\rho)$, $L(n,\rho,t)$ and $\overline{L}(n,\rho,t)$, for $\rho, t > 0$, by the following ones:

$$\begin{aligned}
&L'(n,\rho) = \{j = 3,4,\cdots :\ \mu(((j-3)k_n\Delta_n, (j+2)k_n\Delta_n] \times E_\rho) = 0\}\\
&L'(n,\rho,t) = \{3,\cdots,[t/k_n\Delta_n]-3\} \cap L'(n,\rho)\\
&\overline{L}'(n,\rho,t) = \{3,\cdots,[t/k_n\Delta_n]-3\} \cap (\mathbb{N}\backslash L'(n,\rho)).
\end{aligned}$$

For any $\rho \in (0,1]$ we write $\mathcal{V}(F)_t^n = \mathcal{V}_t^{n,\rho} + \overline{\mathcal{V}}_t^{n,\rho}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
v_j^n &= F(\widehat{c}_{(j-3)k_n+1}^n, \delta_j^n\widehat{c})\, 1_{\{\|\delta_{j-1}^n\widehat{c}\| \vee \|\delta_{j+1}^n\widehat{c}\| \vee u_n' < \|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}\|\}}\\
\mathcal{V}_t^{n,\rho} &= \textstyle\sum_{j\in L'(n,\rho,t)} v_j^n, \qquad \overline{\mathcal{V}}_t^{n,\rho} = \sum_{j\in \overline{L}'(n,\rho,t)} v_j^n.
\end{aligned}$$

We also set

$$\begin{aligned}
&\delta_j^n\widehat{c}' = \widehat{c}'^n_{jk_n+1} - \widehat{c}'^n_{(j-2)k_n+1}, && \delta_j^n\beta = \beta_{jk_n+1}^n - \beta_{(j-2)k_n+1}^n\\
&w_j^n = \textstyle\sum_{m=-3}^{2} \|\widehat{c}_{(j+m)k_n+1}^n - \widehat{c}'^n_{(j+m)k_n+1}\|, && w_j'^n = (1 + \|\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}\|)^{p-1}\,(1 + \|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}\|)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

(4.12) and the last part of (4.19) yield

$$q \geq 1 \quad\Rightarrow\quad \mathbb{E}\big((w_j^n)^q\big) \leq K_q\,\Delta_n^{(2q-r)\varpi+1-q}, \qquad \mathbb{E}((w_i'^n)^q) \leq K_q. \tag{4.43}$$

Observe that $\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'$ is analogous to γ_i^n, with a doubled time lag, so it satisfies a version of (4.25) and, for $q \geq 2$, we have

$$i \in L'(n,\rho) \ \Rightarrow\ \mathbb{E}\big(\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}_{(j-2)k_n+1}^{n,\rho}\big)\big| \leq K_q\big(\sqrt{\Delta_n}\,\phi_\rho + \Delta_n^{q/4} + \frac{\Delta_n^{q/2}}{\rho^q}\big). \tag{4.44}$$

2) The processes $\mathcal{V}^{n,\rho}$. (3.22) yields

$$|v_j^n| \leq K(1 + \|\widehat{c}_{(j-3)k_n+1}^n\|)^{p-2}\,\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}\|^2\,1_{\{\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}\| > u_n'\}} + K\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}\|^p.$$

Thus a (tedious) computation shows that, with the notation

$$a_j^n = (1 + \|\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}\|)^{p-2}\,\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'\|^2\,1_{\{\|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'\| > u_n'/2\}}, \quad a_j'^n = w_j'^n\Big(w_i^n + (w_i^n)^p + \frac{(w_i^n)^v}{u_n'^v}\Big),$$

with $v > 0$ arbitrary, we have $|v_j^n| \leq K(a_j^n + \|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'\|^p + a_j'^n)$ (with K depending on v). Therefore we have $|\mathcal{V}_t^{n,\rho}| \leq K(B_t^{n,\rho} + C_t^{n,\rho} + D_t^n)$, where

$$B_t^{n,\rho} = \sum_{j\in L'(n,\rho,t)} a_j^n, \qquad C_t^{n,\rho} = \sum_{j\in L'(n,\rho,t)} \|\delta_j^n\widehat{c}'\|^p, \qquad D_t^n = \sum_{j=3}^{[t/k_n\Delta_n]} a_j'^n.$$

First, (4.43) and Hólder's inequality give us $\mathbb{E}(a'^n_j) \le K_{q,v}\Delta_n^{l(q,v)}$ for any $q>1$ and $v>0$, where (recalling (3.7) and (3.19) for w and w') we have set $l(q,v) = \frac{1-r\varpi}{q} - \big(p(1-2\varpi) \vee v(1-2\varpi+\varpi')\big)$. Upon choosing v small enough and q close enough to 1, and in view of (3.7), we see that $l(q,v) > \frac{1}{2}$, thus implying

$$\mathbb{E}(D^n_t) \ \to \ 0. \tag{4.45}$$

Next, we deduce from (4.44) that

$$\mathbb{E}\big(C^{n,\rho}_t\big) \le K\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{i\in L'(n,\rho,t)} \|\delta^n_j \widehat{c}'\|^p \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho\Big)\Big) \le Kt\Big(\phi_\rho + \Delta_n^{p/4} + \frac{\Delta_n^{p/2}}{\rho^p}\Big),$$

and thus, since $p \ge 3$,

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\ \mathbb{E}(|C^{n,\rho}_t|) \ = \ 0. \tag{4.46}$$

The analysis of $B^{n,\rho}_t$ is more complicated. We have $\delta^n_j \widehat{c}' = z^n_j + z'^n_j$, where

$$z^n_j = \overline{\alpha}^n_{jk_n+1} - \overline{\alpha}^n_{(j-2)k_n+1}, \quad z'^n_j = \beta^n_{jk_n+1} - \beta^n_{(j-2)k_n+1} = \frac{1}{k_n}\sum_{m=1}^{k_n} (c^n_{jk_n+m} - c^n_{(j-2)k_n+m}),$$

hence

$$a^n_j \le 4(1+\|\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}\|)^{p-2}\left(\|z^n_j\|^2\, 1_{\{\|z^n_i\|>u'_n/4\}} + \|z'^n_j\|^2\, 1_{\{\|z'^n_i\|>u'_n/4\}}\right).$$

It easily follows that for all $A>1$,

$$B^{n,\rho}_t \ \le \ 16\, B^{n,\rho,1}_t + 4A^{p-2}\, B^{n,\rho,2}_t + \frac{2^p}{A}\, B^{n,\rho,3}_t, \tag{4.47}$$

where

$$\begin{gathered} B^{n,\rho,m}_t = \textstyle\sum_{j\in L'(n,\rho,t)} a(m)^n_j, \qquad a(1)^n_j = (1+\|\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}\|)^{p-2}\, \frac{\|z^n_j\|^3}{u'_n} \\ a(2)^n_j = \|z'^n_j\|^2\, 1_{\{\|z'^n_i\|>u'_n/4\}}, \quad a(3)^n_j = \|\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}\|^{p-1}\, \|z'^n_j\|^2. \end{gathered}$$

On the one hand, (4.19) and (4.20) and Hölder's inequality yield

$$\mathbb{E}(a(1)^n_j \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_{(j-3)k_n\Delta_n+1}) \le \frac{K}{\rho^{p/2-1}}\, \Delta_n^{3/4-\varpi'}.$$

Then, exactly as for (4.46), and since $\varpi' < \frac{1}{4}$, we get for any $\rho>0$:

$$\mathbb{E}\big(B^{n,\rho,1}_t\big) \ \to \ 0. \tag{4.48}$$

On the other hand, observe that $z'^n_j = \mu(\rho)^n_j$, with the notation (4.26), and as soon as $j \in L'(n,\rho)$, so Lemma 4.6 gives us

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\ \mathbb{E}\big(B^{n,\rho,2}_t\big) \ = \ 0. \tag{4.49}$$

Finally, (4.14) shows that $\mathbb{E}(\|z'^n_j\|^q \mid \mathcal{F}^{n,\rho}_{(j-2)k_n+1}) \leq K_{q,\rho}\sqrt{\Delta_n}$ for all $q \geq 2$ and $j \in L'(n,\rho)$, whereas $\widehat{c}'^n_{(j-3)k_n+1}$ is $\mathcal{F}^n_{(j-2)k_n+1}$-measurable, so (4.14), (4.19) and successive conditioning yield $\mathbb{E}(a(3)^n_j| \mid \mathcal{G}^\rho) \leq K_{q,\rho}\sqrt{\Delta_n}$. Then, again as for (4.48), one obtains

$$\mathbb{E}\big(B^{n,\rho,3}_t\big) \ \leq \ K_\rho\, t. \tag{4.50}$$

At this stage, we gather (4.45)–(4.50) and obtain, by letting first $n \to \infty$, then $\rho \to 0$, then $A \to \infty$, that

$$\lim_{\rho\to 0}\ \limsup_{n\to\infty}\ \mathbb{E}\big(|\mathcal{V}^{n,\rho}_t|\big) \ = \ 0. \tag{4.51}$$

3) The processes $\overline{\mathcal{V}}^{n,\rho}$. With the previous notation S^ρ_j and N^ρ_t, and on the set $\Omega_{n,\rho,t}$, we have

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}}^{n,\rho}_t = \sum_{m=1}^{N^\rho_t}\ \sum_{j=-2}^{2} v^n_{[S^\rho_m/k_n\Delta_n]+j}\,. \tag{4.52}$$

This is a finite sum (bounded in n for each ω). Letting $S = S^\rho_m$ for m and ρ fixed and $w_n = \frac{S}{k_n\Delta_n} - \big[\frac{S}{k_n\Delta_n}\big]$, we know that for any given $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ the variable $\widehat{c}^n_{([S/k_n\Delta_n]+j)k_n+1}$ converge in probability to c_{S-} if $j < 0$ and to c_S if $j > 0$, whereas for $j = 0$ we have $\widehat{c}^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]k_n+1} - w_n c_S - (1-w_n)c_S \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$. This in turn implies

$$j < 0 \text{ or } j > 2 \ \Rightarrow\ \delta^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]+j}\widehat{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0$$

$$\delta^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]}\widehat{c} - (1-w_n)\Delta c_S \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0, \quad \delta^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]+1}\widehat{c} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \Delta c_S, \quad \delta^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]+2}\widehat{c} - w_n\Delta c_S \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

By virtue of the definition of v^n_j, and since $u'_n \to 0$ and also since w_n is almost surely in $(0,1)$ and F is continuous and $F(x,0) = 0$, one readily deduces that

$$v^n_{[S/k_n\Delta_n]+j} \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ \begin{cases} F(c_{S-},\Delta c_S) & \text{if } j = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Coming back to (4.52), we deduce that

$$\overline{\mathcal{V}}^{n,\rho}_t \ \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}\ \overline{\mathcal{V}}^\rho_t := \sum_{m=1}^{N^\rho_t} F(c_{S^\rho_m-},\Delta c_{S^\rho_m}). \tag{4.53}$$

In view of (3.22), an application of the dominated convergence theorem gives $\overline{\mathcal{V}}^\rho_t \to \mathcal{V}(F)_t$. Then (3.23) follows from $\mathcal{V}(F)^n_t = \mathcal{V}^{n,\rho}_t + \overline{\mathcal{V}}^{n,\rho}_t$ and (4.51) and (4.53), and the proof of Theorem 3.5 is complete.

4.11 Proof of Theorem 3.8.

(a) is almost obvious: indeed, $\overline{V}(g)^n_t$ converges with the rate $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}}$ and is asymptotically normal with asymptotic variance $2tg'(c)^2c^2$ (g' is the derivative of g). However, since g is one-to-one, the model index by the new parameter $tg(c)$ is regular, and the MLE is $tg(\widehat{c}_n)$, where $\widehat{c}_c = \sum_{i=1}^{[t/\Delta_n]} (\Delta_i^n X)^2$, and clearly $tg(\widehat{c}_n)$ has the same asymptotic properties as $\overline{V}(g)_t^n$: this proves the result.

(b) is also obvious: the properties of T_t^n hold for all continuous processes X satisfying (A-0). Then, using the toy model of (a), the optimality proved above implies that $tH(c) \geq 2tg'(c)^2 c^2$ for any constant $c > 0$, that is $H \geq \overline{h}$.

References

[1] Alvarez, A., Panloup, P., Pontier, M. and Savy, N. (2010). Estimation of the instantaneous volatility. *Statistical Inference for Stochastic Processes* **15**, 27-59.

[2] Clément, E., Delattre, S. and Gloter, A. (2012). An infinite dimensional convolution theorem with applications to the efficient estimation of the integrated volatility. Preprint.

[3] Mancini, C. (2009). Non-parametric threshold estimation for models with stochastic diffusion coefficient and jumps. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **36**, 270-296.

[4] Mancini, C. (2011). Speed of convergence of the threshold estimator of integrated variance. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **121**, 845-855.

[5] Jacod, J. and Shiryaev, A.N. (2003). *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, 2nd ed. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[6] Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (2012). *Discretization of Processes*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[7] Vetter, M. (2010). Limit theorems for bipower variation of semimartingales. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **120**, 22-38.

[8] Vetter, M. (2011). Estimation of integrated volatility of volatility with applications to a goodness-of-fit testing. Preprint.